
Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus,
*A Vindication of both Parts of the Preser-
vative against Popery, &c.*

July 4. 1688.

Gnil. Needham, R. R.
in Christo P. ac D.D.
Wilhelmo Archiepisc.
Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus,
*A Vindication of both Parts of the Preser-
vative against Popery, &c.*

July 4. 1688.

Gnil. Needham, R. R.
in Christo P. ac D.D.
Wilhelmo Archiepisc.
Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

dup
A
VINDICATION
OF
Both PARTS
OF THE
Preservative
AGAINST
POPERY:
IN
ANSWER
TO THE
CAVILS
OF
LEWIS SABRAN, Jesuit.

By WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D.D.
Master of the Temple.

LONDON:

Printed for William Rogers at the Sun, over against
St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet. 1688.

DEWIS SIBNEY JAMES

WILLIAM SIBNEY JAMES

WILLIAM SIBNEY JAMES
WILLIAM SIBNEY JAMES
WILLIAM SIBNEY JAMES

TO THE
R E A D E R.

I Must confess, *F. Lewis Sabran* of the Society of Jesus, as he writes himself, has all the good Qualities belonging to his Order, excepting that Learning, which some of his Order have formerly had, but he is excusable for that, because of late, that has been the least of their care; but what they want in Learning, they make up in Confidence and Noise, which is a nearer conformity to the temper and spirit of their first Founder.

When I first saw his Sheet which he wrote against the First Part of the Preservative, I read it over, and laid it aside, as I thought it deserved; for I easily perceived, that he could not, or would not understand the plainest sense, and I saw nothing he had objected, which could impose upon the most unlearned Protestant; and I had no mind to engage with a Man, who has not Understanding enough to be Confuted: But the honest Footman thought fit to call him to an account, and I believe all impartial Men thought the Footman had the better of him, and yet the Jesuite had an honourable occasion to retreat, had his Wit served him to take it; for no Man would have expected that a Jesuite should have encountered a Footman; but here his Courage out-ran his Wit, as it often happens to Knights Errant in their bold Adventures.

I do intend as little as possibly I can to concern my self in the Dispute between the Jesuite and the Footman; the

B

Footman

To the READER.

Footman is able to Defend himself, and I e'en quake for the Jesuite for fear he should; but having a little leisure at present, I will spare some few hours to Vindicate the Preservative from this Jesuite's Cavils, for it will appear, that they are no better. As for those many good words he has bestowed on me, I take them for Complements on course, and to be plain with him, they are all lost upon me, for when I have Reason and Truth on my side, I am perfectly insensible of all the Sportings of Wit and Satyr, for there are no Jest's bite, but those that are true.

I do not intend to pursue this Jesuite in all his rambling Excursions, but shall keep close to my business, to Vindicate The Preservative, and that in as few words as I can; and this will come into a very narrow compass; for he has as little to say, as ever man had, if you keep him out of his Common-place Disputes; but if you suffer him to draw you into those beaten Roads, there is no end of him; for he has the Confidence of a Jesuite to repeat all the old baffled Arguments without blushing.

I confess, I am a little ashamed to meddle with so trifling an Adversary, and know not how I shall Answer it to the Ingenious Gentlemen of the Temple, to whom he so often Appeals against the Master, for spending my time so ill, unless his Character of a Jesuite will plead my excuse, which has been a formidable Name in former Ages: and if this will do, I have a very honourable and a very easie Task of it, an Adversary to encounter with the glorious Character of a Jesuite, but without the Sense of a Footman.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
FIRST PART
OF THE
Preservative.

THE Charge against me is very formidable, Answer to
that I advance such Principles in the *Preservative* P. 4
Preservative, as make void the use of Reason, Faith,
Fathers, Councils, Scripture, and Moral Honesty, if he
had said less, he might sooner have been believed, or
might have proved it better, when such wild and ex-
travagant Accusations confute themselves; but *Jesuits*
commonly spoil all by over-doing. Let us examine
particulars.

SECT. I.

*The Principles which are pretended to overthrow all right
Use of Common Sense Vindicated.*

THE first instance of this nature is, that I Charge *Ibid.*
*Catholics with this great Crime, that they will not
allow the reading Heretical Books, and prove my Charge,*

A Vindication of the First Part of

because God not only allows, but requires it. The Paragraph he refers to is in p. 3. of the *Preservative*, in these words:

Men of weak judgments, and who are not skilled in the Laws of Disputation, may easily be imposed on by cunning Sophisters, and such as lie in wait to deceive: the Church of Rome is very sensible of this, and therefore will not suffer her People to dispute their Religion, or to read Heretical Books, nay not so much as to look into the Bible it self: but though we allow all this to our People, as that which God not only allows but requires, &c. from hence he charges me with saying, that God not only allows but requires People to read *Heretical Books*. But the honest *Footman* plainly told him, what the meaning of *Heretical Books* was, that I spoke the Language of their Church, which calls all Books *Heretical* which are not of the *Roman* stamp: and this is all that I meant by it, as every honest Reader would see. Does not he use the very same way of speaking himself in the same Paragraph, when he retorts this Crime upon us, that we use all endeavours to hinder our Flocks from hearing *Catholick Sermons*, and reading *Catholick Books*, for are any Christians so absurd as to forbid People to hear *Catholick Sermons*, and to read *Catholick Books*? No sure, not what they think *Catholick*: and why may not I use *Heretical*, as well as he use *Catholick* in the sense of the Church of *Rome*? by *Heretical* meaning such Books as the Church of *Rome* calls *Heretical*, as by *Catholick* he means such Books as the Church of *Rome* calls *Catholick*; for they are both equally *Heretical* and *Catholick*.

Answer p. 4.

But he complains in the *Preservative* Considered, p. 4. That he had asked three very material Questions, and the *Footman* had not vouchsafed an Answer to them,

them, and I believe the *Footman* was in the right, for they deserved none. But let us hear them, *This* (says he) *seemed to me extravagant, not to say impious, and to all those who have inherited from St. Paul that Faith to which he exacts so firm and unwavering an adherency, that if an Angel from Heaven should teach us any thing in opposition to it, we ought not to mind him, or return him any other Answer than Anathema. How can, said I, this positive certainty stand with an obligation of reading Heretical Books which oppose that Faith, to frame by them, and settle a judgment.* But now, if these Heretical Books do not oppose that Faith, which was Preached by St. Paul, I hope, there was no need of answering this Question; and if the Catholick Books do, I would desire him to Answer the Question; and if there be a Dispute depending, which of them contradicts St. Paul's Doctrine, I would desire him to tell me, How we shall know, which of them does it, without examining them? When we know these Books, which contradict St Paul's Doctrine, we will reject them with an Anathema, and for that reason we reject the Council of Trent, whose Authority we think to be inferior to an Angels, and that shews, that we do not think rejecting and yet reading such Books to make void common Sense; for though we reject the Council of Trent, yet we read it, as they find to their cost.

His next Question (or else I cannot make three of them) is, *By what Text doth God deliver this Injunction?* viz, of reading Heretical Books; which in his Sense of Heretical Books is a very senseless Question; for no man pretends, that God commands us to read Books, which we know to be Heretical; though a man who is inquiring after Truth, must read such Books, as the several divided Sects of Christians may call Heretical.

But

A Vindication of the First Part of

But his killing Question is to come. *I asked further, How standing to the first Principles of Common Sense, a Church which declares all men bound to judge for themselves, could countenance Laws which exact of Dissenters, that they stand not to that their Judgment, but comply against it, and that constrain their liberty of judging by the dread of Excommunications, Sequestrations, Imprisonments, &c. which is to make it Death not to act against a strict Duty of Conscience, acknowledged by the Persecutors to be such.*

But what is this to reading Heretical Books? Is there any Law in the Church of *England*, thus to punish men for reading Heretical Books? There is we know in the Church of *Rome*, where besides other Heretical Books, to have and to read the Bible in the vulgar Tongue without License, which is rarely granted, and ought not to be at all, brings a man in danger of the Inquisition, which one word signifies more than any man can tell, but he who has felt it, witness the late account of the Inquisition of *Goa*.

Well, but to allow a liberty of Judging, and not to suffer men to stand to their Judgment, is contrary to Common Sense: It is so, but who gives a liberty of Judging, and forbids men to stand to their own Judgment? I am sure, the Church of *England* accounts any man a Knave, who contradicts his own Judgment and Conscience. There is no Inquisition for mens private Opinions, no ransacking Consciences in the Church of *England*, as we know, where there is.

Yes! *We constrain this liberty of Judging by the dread of Excommunications, Sequestrations, Imprisonments, Exclusion from the chiefest Properties of free born Subjects, even by Hanging and Quartering; which is to make it Death not to act against a strict Duty of Conscience, acknowledged*

*knowledge*d by the Persecutors to be such. It is a blessed time for these Jesuits, who like that no body should be able to Persecute but themselves, to rail at Persecution; but let that pass. It seems then it is contrary to Common Sense to allow a liberty of Judging, and to deny a liberty of Practice; for God, suppose, to allow men to choose their Religion, and to Damn them, if they choose wrong. That is to say, a Natural liberty of Judgment, and by the same reason, the Natural liberty of Will, is inconsistent with all Government in Church and State: If this were so, it would indeed make Persecution (as he calls it) in a free-judging Church very absurd, but it is very reconcileable to Common Sense, for a Church which denies this liberty of Judging, to Persecute too; and this justifies the Persecutions of the Church of Rome: Let Protestants here see, if such Jesuits could rule the Roast, what it will cost them to part with their liberty of Judging; they loose their Argument against Persecution: for an Infallible Church which will not suffer men to Judge, may with good Reason Persecute them, if they do: that all men, who like Liberty of Conscience, are concerned to oppose Popery, which it seems is the only Religion, that can make it reasonable to Persecute, nay, which makes it unreasonable not to Persecute, for it is as much against Common Sense for a Church, which denies a liberty of Judging to allow a liberty of Conscience, as for a Church to deny Liberty of Conscience, which allows a liberty of Judging. Thus far the *Preservative* is safe, and let his following Harangue against the liberty of Judging shift for it self, that is not my business at present.

His next Quarrel is, that (*Preser. p. 4, 5.*) I advise Protestants not to dispute with Papists, *till they*
dis-

Answer, p. 4

disown Infallibility. I own the charge, and repeat it again, that it is a ridiculous thing to dispute with Papists, till they renounce Infallibility, as that is opposed to a liberty of Judging; for so the whole Sentence runs: *Here then let our Protestant fix his Foot, and not stir an inch, till they disown Infallibility, and confess, that every man must Judge for himself in Matters of Religion, according to the Proofs, that are offered to him.* This the Jesuit either designedly concealed, or did not understand, though it is the whole design of that Discourse: For the plain state of the Case is this. The Church of Rome pretends to be Infallible, and upon this pretence she requires us to submit to her Authority, and to receive all the Doctrines she teaches upon her bare Word, without Examination; for we must not Judge for our selves, but learn from an Infallible Church: Now I say, it is a ridiculous thing for such men to pretend to Dispute with us about Religion, when they will not allow that we can judge what is true or false, for it is to no purpose to Dispute, unless we can Judge; and therefore a Protestant before he Disputes with them, ought to exact this Confession from them, that every man must Judge for himself, and ought not to be overruled by the pretended Infallible Authority of the Church against his own Sense and Reason, and this is to make them disown Infallibility, as far as that is Matter of Controversie between us and the Church of Rome, to disown Infallibility as that is opposed to a liberty of Judging. If it be absurd to Dispute with a man, who denies me a liberty of Judging, then I must make him allow me this liberty before I Dispute, and then he must disown the over-ruling Authority of an Infallible Judge, which is a contradiction to such a Liberty.

By

By this time, I suppose, he sees to what little purpose his Objections are ; that to require such a disowning of Infallibility, *is to say, 'Tis impossible to convince a man that in Reason, he ought to submit his Judgment to any other, though Infallible :* No Sir ! but 'tis to say, that I cannot make use of my Reason in any thing, till I am delivered from the Usurping Authority of such an Infallible Judge, who will not suffer me to use my Reason, or to Judge for my self : *It does not make void the use of Common Sense and Reason, when it should lead us to submit to any just Authority ;* but to submit to such an unjust Authority, makes void the use of Common Sense and Reason, because he will not allow us to use our Reason. The *Jews* had no Reason, as he pretends to reject *St. Paul's* Disputation, till he had renounced Infallibility, because he never urged his own Infallibility, as the sole Reason of their Faith, and to debar them from a liberty of Judging, as the Church of *Rome* does ; if he had, it had been as vain a thing for the *Jews* to have Disputed with *St. Paul*, as it is for Protestants to Dispute with Papists.

His next Exception is against those Words, (*Pres. p. 6.*) *What difference is there betwixt mens using their private Judgments to turn Papists, or to turn Protestants ?* To this he answers, *The same as betwixt two sick men, the one whereof chooses to put himself in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an infallible Remedy. (which none but Mountebanks ever had yet) whilst the other chooses his own Simples, and makes his own Medicines.*

The case is this ; I was giving a reason, why Papists, who have any modesty should not dispute with Protestants, because *it is an appeal to every man's private judgment : if ever they make Converts, they must be beholden to every man's private judgment for it, for I think*

A Vindication of the First Part of

men cannot change their opinions, without exercising a private judgment about it; and I suppose when they dispute with men to make them Papists, they intend to convert them by their own private judgments: now what difference is there between mens using their private judgments to turn Papists or to turn Protestants? one indeed may be false, and the other true, but private judgment is private judgment still; and if it be so great a fault for men to use their private judgments, it is as great a fault in a Papist, as it is in a Protestant. So that all that I said is, that there is no difference with respect to mens using their private judgment, whether they use their private judgment to turn Papists, or to turn Protestants, for both is but private judgment; and to confute this, he tells us, that there is a great difference between turning Papist, and turning Protestant, which I granted there was; but is nothing to the present Argument. I say, there is no difference as to the principle or cause of their change, when the change of both is owing to private judgment, and he learnedly proves, that the change itself is different, as widely different, as Papist and Protestant differ. But though the Footman had plainly told him this, the Jesuite had not wit to understand it, and therefore (*Preservative Confid.* p. 11.) adds, *is there no difference then betwixt one, who follows his fancy in chusing his way, and him who chuses a good guide, and follows him, because they both chuse? do both equally rely on their fancy?* I grant, there is a difference between these two, as there is between a Protestant and a Papist; but when the dispute is, whether they shall follow their own reason and judgment, or give up themselves to follow a Guide with a blind and implicate faith, and every man must determine this by his own private judgment, which is the

the Preservative against P O P E R Y.

9

the case I propos'd, which way so ever they determine this question, whether to follow their own reason, or to follow a Guide, in this point, they both equally rely on their own private reason, and judgment, or as he calls it, fancy.

In the next place he says, *I take the Catholicks part, Answer, p. 4. and tho' faintly, yet speak well in so clear a cause. The intention of those Disputes is only to lead you to the infallible Church, and set you upon a Rock, and then it is very natural to renounce your own judgment, when you have an infallible Guide.* This I do alledge as the most plausible pretence to justify Papists in disputing with Protestants, that the end of it is to lead us to an infallible Church. That *our own judgment must bring* Preserv. p. 9. *us to the infallible Guide, but when we have found him, we have no farther use for our own judgment.*

I offer'd two Answers to this, neither of which he durst meddle with, but nibbles at a Passage in each.

The 1. he thus represents, *they cannot with any sense dispute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, because the sense given of Scripture and Fathers takes its Authority from the Church understanding it so.*

But my Answer was this; That if Disputes be only to lead us to the infallible Church, then *it puts an end to all the particular Disputes of Religion between us and the Church of Rome: We may dispute on about an infallible Judge, but they cannot with any sense dispute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, such as Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. for these are to be learnt only from the Church, and cannot be proved by Scripture or Fathers without the Authority of the Church.* Which is a demonstration if Faith must be resolv'd into the infallible Authority of the Church, for then no Arguments are a sufficient foundation for

A Vindication of the First Part of

Faith without the Authority of the Church, or if they be, there is no necessity of resolving our Faith into Church Authority, because we have a good foundation for Faith without it.

*Answer to
Pres. P. 4.*

He answers, *This is false. The sense (of Scripture) takes its authority from God, who spoke that Word, though we are certain, that we have the true sense of that Word, because we receive it from the Church, which is protected and guided in delivering us both the letter and sense, by the infallible Spirit of God, that is to abide with her for ever, according to Christ's promise, John 14. 16.*

This is a choice Paragraph. The Question between us is, Whether they can by Scripture convince a man, who does not yet believe the infallible Authority of the Church, as we Protestants do not, that their Doctrines of Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Worship of Images, &c. are true Gospel-Doctrines: This I say they cannot, if they be true to their own Doctrine, that we cannot be certain, what the true sense of Scripture is, without the infallible Authority of the Church of *Rome*. For a man cannot be convinced by Scripture, till he be sure, what the true sense of Scripture is, and if we cannot be sure of this without relying on the Authority of the Church in expounding Scripture, then a Protestant, who disowns such an Authority, can never be sure, what the true sense of Scripture is, and therefore cannot be convinced by Scripture-Proofs, which shews how absurd it is for a Papist, who professes to believe all this, to attempt to persuade a Protestant who rejects the Authority of their Church, of the truth of Popish Doctrines from Scripture: either he thinks these Doctrines so plainly contained in Scripture, that a man, who rejects the Authority of the Church, may be forced to
acknow-

acknowledge, that they are in Scripture, and then he must reject the necessity of Church-Authority for the understanding of Scripture, which is to yield up a very concerning point to Protestants; or else he must confess, that he does very foolishly or knavishly in urging Scripture-Proofs to a man, who rejects the Authority of their Church, without which he knows there are no Scripture-Proofs of any Authority.

But this, which was the true state of the Controversie, the Jesuite takes no notice of; all that he says is this: That the sense of Scripture takes its Authority from God, that is, is ultimately resolved into God's Authority, who intended such a sense in it, but as to Catholicks, (for such he must mean) their certainty of the sense of Scripture is resolved immediately into the Authority of the Church, which is guided in expounding Scripture by an infallible Spirit: Now is not this the very same, that I said, that all Scripture-Proofs must be resolved into the Authority of the Church, and are not good without it, as it is impossible they should be, if we cannot certainly know, what the true sense of Scripture is, but from the Exposition of the Church. And yet if the Church of *Rome* be no more infallible in delivering the sense of Scripture, than in delivering the letter of it, there is no great encouragement to rely on her infallibility: as is evident from the many Corruptions of their Vulgar Latine, which one Pope corrected after another, and yet it is not corrected still; that it was a little over-sight in this Jesuite, (though possibly he knew nothing of the matter) to make the Church equally infallible in delivering the letter and the sense of Scripture.

But to do him right, he seems to offer at something of sense in his dispute between *John and William*, which
is

A Vindication of the First Part of

is the right way to a place. For, says he, *is John disabled from convincing William of his mistake by reasons, because he hath with him a Guide who certainly knows the way, and that he himself would certainly pass by those reasons, if his Guide assured him, that he applied them ill and wrongly to that way.* This has something of argument in it, and therefore shall be considered, and I am glad to meet with any thing, that deserves to be considered.

The sum of his Argument (which I shall represent fairly for him, because he has not shewn it to the best advantage) is this. That Roman-Catholicks have two ways of finding out the sense of Scripture, either by the use of Reason, or by the Expositions of an infallible Guide: but that Reason must be subordinate to the Guide, and if Reason dictates one sense of Scripture, and the Church teaches another, Reason must submit, and a true Catholick must embrace the sense of the Church, though it be against his Reason; but yet if Reason, and his Guide be both of a side, and he can prove by Reason, that to be the true sense of Scripture, which the Church gives of it, he may then wave the Authority of the Church, when he disputes with those, who reject such Authority, and argue from the reasons of things, and the natural interpretation of Scripture it self. As *John* may convince *William*, who rejects the infallibility of *John's* Guide, which is the true way by plain reason, while his reason is not contradicted by his Guide: and if our Jesuite can make more of this Argument himself, let him. I am sure he has spoiled it by repeating it in his *Preserv. Consider.* p. 11. *John is not disabled of convincing William of his mistake, because he receives the reasons he uses from an infallible Guide.* Where he has set it upon another bottom, and
a very

a very silly one for his purpose: for if the force of his Reasons be resolved into the Authority of an infallible Guide, it is all lost to him, who disowns the infallibility of the Guide: or if he means, that *John* is taught such Reasons by an infallible Guide, as are able by their own evidence to convince *William* without any regard to the infallibility of the Guide, we desire no more than to see such Reasons, and to be left to judge for our selves; but this ends in a Protestant Resolution of Faith, for every man to judge for himself according to the evidence of Reason, which in it self is neither more nor less evident, for being proposed or learnt from a fallible or infallible Guide. And yet by what follows, he can mean no more, but that the Authority of an infallible Judge must over-rule every Man's private Reason; for *he appeals to the learned Gentlemen of the Temple, hoping they will joyn with him maintaining against their Master, that all the Judges of the Land may very reasonably convince by Law an impertinent Party, though he should oppose, that they may not do it, because their interpretation of the Law is to deliver the true sense of it.* Which is glorious Nonsense, that all the Judges of the Land can convince a man, who is not convinced, but declares still, that they have not given the true sense of the Law. In all Civil Causes there must be a final judgment, and every private man must submit to the decision of Authority, whether his own reason be satisfied or not; but it is not so in matters of Religion, in which no man at the peril of his Soul must be over-ruled by any Authority, till he be first convinced. So that the Jesuite had said a good thing by chance, but for want of understanding it, had lost it again; and any man may see, that I could as easily have lost it, as he, had I a mind to it; but

A Vindication of the First Part of

but I will not part with it without an Answer, because it is the most plausible thing, that can be said, and possibly other men may understand it, who can't answer it, though he don't.

His Argument then as first proposed is this, That they allow of Reason in expounding Scripture, so long as they do not contradict the Sense and Exposition of the Church; and therefore they may dispute with Hereticks from Scripture, without concerning the Authority of the Church in the dispute. Now in answer to this, there are some material Questions to be asked. As,

1. Whether they can dispute with Protestants by Scripture-Arguments without allowing them to judge of the sense of Scripture by their own private Reason? and whether this be agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that every man may judge of the sense of Scripture by his own private Reason?

2. Whether the Scripture be so plain and perspicuous, especially in the Doctrines in dispute between us and the Church of *Rome*, that every honest impartial Inquirer may find the true sense of them without an infallible Interpreter? if they be, I think, they never ought to talk of the obscurity of Scripture, nor the necessity of an infallible Judge more; if they be not, and if they know, that they are not, then they know before hand, that the evidence of Scripture alone is not sufficient to convince a Protestant, who rejects an infallible Judge, and then it is a senseless thing for them to attempt the proof of such Doctrines by Scripture. Good Catholicks are satisfied with the Authority of the Church, and Hereticks who reject such an infallible Authority, cannot be confuted and convinced by meer Scripture.

3. I ask again, Whether the evidence of Reason in expounding Scripture be a sufficient Foundation for a Divine Faith? if it be, then Protestants, who disown an Infallible Judge, may have a true Divine Faith without the Infallibility of the Church, and then we may be true Believers without being *Roman-Catholicks*; and I should be glad to hear that out of the mouth of a *Jesuite*, for there is good use to be made of such a confession: if Scripture as expounded by Reason without an Infallible Judge is not a sufficient Foundation for a Divine Faith, then to what end does their disputing with Protestants from Scripture serve, if this cannot make them true Believers.

4. I ask once more, Whether the belief of the Scriptures themselves must not be resolved into the Authority of the Church? whether any man can believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God without it? if they cannot (and I would be glad to hear the *Jesuite* say they can) then I am sure the Scripture is no proof of any thing without the Churches Authority, and it is an absurd thing for those who think so to dispute from Scripture against those who deny the Authority of the Church.

From hence I think, it evidently appears, that the Authority of the Scriptures, and the Authority of the Church, are not two distinct Arguments in the Church of *Rome*, for then I grant, they might use either way of proof, and dispute from Scripture against those, who deny the Authority of the Church; but if the Authority of the Scripture as to us is resolved into the Authority of the Church, then the Scripture alone is no Argument, but the Authority of the Church is all. Wherefore do you believe the Scripture? Because the Church tells me it is the Word of God; Wherefore do you believe this to be the sense of Scripture? Because the Church so expounds it: Is not this the true Resolution of the *Roman* Faith? Is this Misrepresenting too? But if it be the truth, does not every

man see, that as to us the Scripture has no Authority, no sense, but from the Church, and therefore can prove nothing separated from the Authority of the Church.

If they allow of any Proofs from Scripture separated from the Authority of the Church, then whether they will or no, they must allow of the Protestant Resolution of Faith; that is, to resolve my Faith into the Authority of the Scriptures, as expounded with the best reason and judgment I have, in the careful use of all such means, as are necessary for the understanding that Holy Book: now if they will allow this to be a good Resolution of Faith, we will allow of all their Scripture-proofs, and give them leave to make us Converts to the Church of *Rome* by Scripture, if they can: but if they do allow of this, then we Protestants are in a very good way already as to the Resolution of our Faith, and so that Controversie is at an end; and if they will not allow this, then they confess, that Scripture-proofs of themselves are not good, for if they were, we might certainly resolve our Faith as Protestants do, immediately into the Authority of Scripture.

And thus much for *John* and *William* and the Infallible Guide; if *John* has any Reasons independent on the Authority of his Guide, he may then try his skill upon *William*, who rejects his Guide, but if all his other Reasons are resolved into the Authority of his Guide, and are no good Reasons without it, then he may spare his Reasons till he has made *William* submit to his Guide. And this is the case between the Scripture and the Church, in the Church of *Rome*: the Scripture wholly depends both for its Authority and Interpretation on the Authority of the Church, and therefore can signifie nothing and prove nothing, but what the Church makes it signifie and prove. The Scriptures may be supposed to be the Word of God, and to have some sense antecedent to the Churches Authority, but no man can know this without the Church, and there-
fore

fore as to us both the Authority and Interpretation of the Scripture depends upon the Authority of the Church, and is no Argument, to prove any thing by itself.

But I cannot pass on without taking notice of a pleasant Answer the *Jesuite* gives to a very substantial Argument of the *Footman*, To prove that at least some Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* by their own confession, cannot be proved by Scripture without the Authority of the Church, he shews that *Petrus de Alliaco*, *Scotus*, and *Tonstal* do confess, that Transubstantiation is not founded upon any necessary Scripture-proofs, but on the Authority of the Church, for the Scripture might, and that very reasonably too, be expounded to another sense, had not the Church determined otherwise. Now what does the *Jesuite* say to this? 1. He prevericates like a *Jesuite* in repeating the Argument, *That the Words of Scripture brought in proof of Transubstantiation might be taken in a different sense from that which the Catholick Church hath ever received and delivered; and that had not the Church ever taught that sense, one might believe otherwise, for all the letter of Scripture:* for the Authors alledged by the *Footman* do not say, as the *Jesuite* makes them, that the Catholick Church hath ever received and delivered that sense of Transubstantiation, which the Church of *Rome* now teaches; but *Tonstal* expressly declares the contrary in the words there cited, *That it was free for all men, till the Council of Lateran to follow their own conjectures as concerning the manner of the Presence.* Which supposes, that this Doctrine was never determined by the Church till the Council of *Lateran*, and therefore not ever received, and delivered, and taught by the *Catholick Church*. 2. In a Parenthesis he adds, *how truly* (this is said of the Catholick Divines, that they did affirm this) *it belongs not to my present purpose:* very truly said, it is not to his purpose, but very much against it: but if he means, that he was not concerned to know, whether

*Preservative
Considered,
p. 11.*

these passages are truly cited from these Authors, it seems he is not concerned to defend his Argument, for that is very much concerned in it, it is a plain confession he had nothing to say, and therefore would not be concerned about it: and will our Learned Jesuite confess, that he is so ignorant as not to know that this was said by *Petrus de Alliaco*, *Scotus*, and *Tomstall*? or will he so easily give up such men as these, and let the ingenious *Footman* run away with them and his Argument together.

3. He answers, *let it be so; but what follows here? but the necessity of an unerring Interpreter?* What follows? why it follows, that they cannot prove Transubstantiation from Scripture without the Authority of the Church, and consequently that it is not Scripture but their Church they rely on for the proof of their Doctrines, which is the thing the Footman intended to prove by it, and has done it effectually: but how an *unerring Interpreter* follows from hence, I cannot see, unless it be to prove that to be in Scripture, which the most searching and inquisitive men cannot find there: and this indeed is the true use of an *unerring Interpreter* in the Church of *Rome*, to impose upon mens Faith to believe that to be in Scripture, which no man can see there; for what men can see there, one would think they might believe to be there, without an *unerring Interpreter*. As for what he adds, that the *Arians* gave as natural a sense of 1 John 5. 7, 8. as the Catholics did, is to be answered at present only with abhorrence and detestation. But to proceed.

In the next place, to shew them, how absurd it is to dispute even about an infallible Judge, I direct our Protestants to ask them, *Whether the belief of an Infallible Judge must be resolved into every man's private judgment? Whether it be not necessary to believe this with a Divine Faith? And whether there can be any Divine Faith without an Infallible Judge?* To this the Jesuite answers (*Ans. p. 4*)
There

There can be no Divine Faith without a Divine Revelation, nor a prudent one without a Moral Evidence in the Motives of Credibility, on which may be grounded the evident obligation to accept it. This he calls a Moral Infallibility, and shews by what steps, it may fasten on God's Veracity, and with a submission not capable of any doubt, embrace the revealed Truth. Now all this amounts to no more than Protestant certainty, void of all doubt, which the Church of Rome would never yet allow to be a Divine and Infallible Faith. But what is this to my Question? Which was not, Whether a Divine Faith required a Divine Revelation, but whether there can be any Divine Faith without an Infallible Judge? which it seems, he durst not own, nor say one word to. And yet here lay the force of the Argument, as I told him in the same place, If we must believe the Infallibility of the Pope or Church of Rome, with an infallible Faith, there is an end of Disputing; for no Reasons or Arguments, not the Authority of the Scripture itself (which I hope he means, by his Divine Revelation) without an infallible Judge, can beget an Infallible Faith, according to the Roman Doctors. For this Reason they charge the Protestant Faith with uncertainty, and will not allow it to be a Divine, but Humane Faith, though it is built upon the firmest Reasons, the best Authority, and the most express Scripture, that can be had for any thing; but because we do not pretend to rely upon the authority of a living infallible judge, forsooth, our Faith is uncertain, humane, and fallible. This he knew to be true, and yet knew, that he could not build the belief of an Infallible Judge upon the authority of an Infallible Judge, unless he could find one Infallible Judge to give testimony to the Infallibility of another, and a third to give testimony to the second, and thus to dance round in a circle of Infallibility, without finding any beginning or end; and therefore he slips this pretence of an Infallible Judge, and would found a Divine Faith upon revelation,

A Vindication of the First Part of

velation, or prudential motives of credibility, which indeed is to quit Infallibility, and to take up with a Protestant moral certainty, or *moral infallibility* as he calls it, that he may retain the name at least, when the thing is lost.

Nay, he gives a substantial Reason against an Infallible Faith of the Churches Infallibility. *For if the Infallibility of the Church were more than Morally Evident, it were impossible, that any Heresie should be,* the wisest word, that he has said yet, but I shall make him repent of saying it, before I have done; for this is an evident demonstration against Infallibility.

He says, we can have no more than a *Moral Evidence for the Infallibility of the Church*; and if this be true, and our Faith be founded upon the Authority of the Church, then we can have no more than a Moral Evidence for the Truth of the Christian Religion, or any Article of it: for as I argued in that very place. *Though the Judge be Infallible, if I be not infallibly assured of this, (if I have only a Moral Evidence of his Infallibility) I can never arrive to Infallibility in any thing, (or can never get higher than a Moral Certainty) for I can never be more certain, that his Determinations are Infallible, then I am, that he himself is Infallible, and if I have but a moral assurance of this, I can be but morally assured of the rest, for the Building cannot be more firm than the Foundation is; and thus there is an end to all the Roman Pretences to Infallibility.* Though he slipt this at first Reading, I hope he may judge it worth Answering upon second Thoughts.

But how he will get rid of his own Reason, I cannot guess, *if the Infallibility of the Church were more than Morally Evident, it were impossible, that any Heresies should be:* by which he either means, that *de facto* the Being of Heresies in the World is a sensible Argument, that there is no Infallible assurance of the Infallibility of the Church; for an Infallible Proof cannot be resisted, and then all the
World

World must believe the Churches Infallibility, and give up themselves to the Directions of the Church, and then there could be no Heresies: or else his meaning is, that since there must be Heresies in the World, as the Apostle tells us, therefore God has given us no more than a Moral Evidence of the Infallibility of the Church; because an Infallible assurance of this would have prevented all Heresies, which God, it seems, for very wise Reasons, did not intend thus irresistibly to prevent.

Now rightly to understand this Matter, I would desire to know why they say God has bestowed Infallibility on the Church? Was it not to prevent Heresies and Schisms? Is not this the Popish Objection against the Protestant Resolution of Faith, that for want of an Infallible Guide men fall into Errors and Heresies, and divide and disturb the Peace of the Church with Schisms? Is not this the great Reason they urge for the necessity of an Infallible Guide to prevent all Heresies and Schisms? and yet now it seems, there must be no more than a Moral Evidence for the Infallibility of the Church, that there may be Heresies: How often have they been told by Protestant Divines, that if God intend an Infallible Judge to prevent all Heresies, the Being of an Infallible Judge ought to be as evident and demonstrable, as that there is a Sun in the Heavens, that all men might see him, and believe him: and now they tell us, This Infallible Judge must not be thus Evident, that men might not know him, that there may be room for Heresies to creep into the World. Now methinks it is pretty odd, that there should be an Infallible Judge to keep Heresies out of the Church, and that the Being of this Judge should be no more than Morally Evident, that Heresies may creep into the Church. It seems the Romish Resolution of Faith leaves as great Scope for Heresies to come into the Church, as the Protestants does, and therefore from henceforward, all the
Argu-

A Vindication of the First Part of

Arguments for Infallibility from the necessity of keeping Heresies out of the Church, are given up; and they must never more object against the Protestant Rule of Faith, that by this means Heresies get into the Church. His Argument, I confess, concludes fully against any Infallible Certainty of an Infallible Judge; and the reason is to the full as good against an Infallible Judge, as against an Infallible way of knowing, that there is one, And now since I cannot be Infallibly assured of this Infallible Judge, I will trouble my head no further about him, and therefore leave his *Preservative Considered*, p. 13, &c. to any *Footman* that pleases to answer it.

*Answer to
Preser. p. 5.*

His next Objection is much of the same nature. That Protestants cannot reasonably be disputed into Popery, as that signifies, *resolving our Faith into the infallible Authority of the Church to believe whatever the Church believes, and for no other reason, but because the Church teaches it*, and the reason, whereby I proved it, is, because *no Arguments or Disputations can give me an infallible certainty of the infallibility of the Church*. And this he has just now granted, that we cannot have an infallible certainty, but only a moral evidence for the infallibility of the Church, and if there can be no more than a moral evidence for this, then no Arguments can give us an infallible certainty of it, because this cannot be had. And what has he to say now? a very shrewd Objection I assure you, and it is this: *We saw Dr. Sherlock just now pleading for the Jews against St. Paul, (that I have accounted for already) now he reasons against Christ our God, blessed for ever more. His words prove that Christ, who owned himself infallible, did imprudently to Preach or work Miracles; for since they could not give an infallible certainty, (an evident one he means by his whole Discourse) no prudent Jew, nor Gentile, could be disputed by him into Faith.* Those who corrected his first Paper for him, which they

they have done in several places, as being sensible the Footman had great advantage of his loose way of Writing, have made some Alterations here in the *Preservative Considered*, p. 24. *This Position proving, that Christ our Lord, who owned himself infallible, did imprudently to Preach or work Miracles, by which he exacted a certain firm Faith grounded upon his Infallibility in Teaching: for since his Preaching and Miracles did not give an evident infallible certainty of his Infallibility, (and such an evident one Dr. Sherlock must mean, for the certainty we have of a real Infallibility cannot be in reality fallible) no prudent Jew or Gentile could be disputed by Christ into Faith.* This is expressed with greater art and subtilty than the first, but however they palliate it, it is equally absurd and senseless. The Fallacy lies only in this, that by an *infallible certainty*, they will have me mean only a *certain firm faith*, or an *evident certainty*, whereas I plainly mean such an infallible certainty, as the Church of *Rome* opposes to the *certain firm faith*, and *evident certainty* of Protestants.

The Papists perpetually object against Protestants, that their Faith is uncertain; we assert, that our Faith is not uncertain; that we have all the *evident certainty*, that the thing is capable of: but this will not satisfy them, unless we can produce some such infallible certainty, as they pretend to have; and by this Argument they persuade men to forsake our Communion, and to go over to the Church of *Rome*, that they may have the certainty of Infallibility for their Faith: This I tell our Protestants, they cannot be disputed into, because no Reasons or Disputations can give them an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church, and yet unless they can be infallibly assured of that, they are no nearer to Infallibility in the Church of *Rome*, than in the Church of *England*: now had our Jesuite read this, as he ought to have done

A Vindication of the First Part of

before he answered it, had it been possible for him had he not been a Jesuite, to have said, that by *infallible*, I meant *evident*? for we Protestants pretend to *evident certainty*, and this we have, and *Jews and Gentiles* might have of Christ's Preaching and Miracles, and when I opposed this *Infallible Certainty* to Protestant Certainty, surely I meant as much more by it then *Evident* as Papists do, when notwithstanding all our Protestant Evidence, they charge us with the want of *Infallibility*. And yet for ought I can perceive now, they are contented to let *Evident Certainty* pass for *Infallible*, and the Corrector of F. Sabran's Sheet has given us a notable reason for it, for which Protestants are bound to thank him, for he has made them all *infallible*. *For the certainty we have of a real Infallibility cannot be in reality fallible*. That is to say, when the Object is *infallibly true*, our Faith or Assent to it, cannot be *fallible*: and thus before they can prove us Protestants to be *fallible* Creatures any more, they must prove, that what we believe, *viz.* the Holy Scriptures, and the Apostles Creed, are not *infallibly true*. Though I thought the *Infallibility* of Faith had not been owing to the Object of our Faith, but to the Evidence of it.

*Defence of
Pris. p. 7.*

This the Footman plainly saw, and therefore minds him of the difference between *True Certainty and Infallibility*. Doth Dr. Sherlock say, that the Jews could not be disputed into Faith, unless that Faith were *infallible*? No, he leaves that to be talked of by you, who are the great Pretenders to it. The Jesuite is very angry at the Reverend Licensor for this. What do you own, that we only are to look on the Faith even as preached by Christ, to be necessarily *infallible*? Is it no part of your belief that you are any way concerned in, that that certain Faith which Christ exacted from the Jews, St. Paul from each Christian, must of necessity be *infallible*? Fair and softly! we believe, whatever
Christ

Christ and St. Paul taught to be infallibly true, but we know, that a fallible Creature, as all private Christians at least are, cannot believe with an infallible Faith; that is, no man, who knows himself fallible, though he may be very certain of what he believes, can say he is infallible in his Faith, unless there be a Divine Promise, that he shall never err; for if he be not infallible, he can be infallible in nothing. Protestants believe Christ to be an infallible Teacher, and the Christian Faith to be infallibly true, and this they believe with all the firmness and certainty of assent; but this is not, what the Church of Rome used to call Infallibility; though the Jesuite (if it be not meer want of understanding in him) seems to be hammering out a new notion of Infallibility; but it is but a rude and imperfect Embryo yet, we shall see, what they will make of it in time.

And here I find my self obliged to look a little backwards, to see how he states the Churches Infallibility, for he mightily complains of Protestant Misrepresentations about it.

Preservat. Consider. p. 13.

Our Guide then, he tells us, *is the Catholick Church, either diffusive in its whole extent*, (that is, as it contains or signifies the whole number of Christians all the World over) *or representative in its Head and Bishops, the Pope and a General Council. The Church diffusive*, or the whole number of Christians on Earth, is most certainly the true notion of *the Catholick Church* on Earth; is that Church, to which, most of the Promises made to The Church in Scripture, are made; but how this *Church diffusive* should be *our Guide*, wants to be explained: if the Church diffusive, or the whole number of Christians, is the Guide, who is to be guided, unless the Guide is to be a Guide only to himself: However, I hope then every particular Christian will be allowed a private judgment of his own; for the Church diffusive will be a very strange Guide, if it cannot

A Vindication of the First Part of

use its own reason and judgment ; and how the whole, which consists of all particular Christians, should judge for itself, when no particular Christian must judge, is somewhat mysterious : that is, that all Christians must judge, and yet none must judge. But I will not dispute with him about this, but whenever he will collect the Votes of the Church diffusive, or of all the Christians in the World, I promise to subscribe to their Definitions

The *Representative Church*, is the *Head and Bishops, the Pope and a General Council*. I thought, the Pope in Jesuits Divinity, had been the Church *virtual*, and a General Council the Church *representative*. But I have in a late Discourse proved, that the Pope is not the Head of the Catholick Church, nor a Council of Bishops the representative of it, and he may try his skill upon it, when he pleases.

A Discourse
concerning the
Nature and
Unity of the
Catholick
Church.

Now it seems, the Church-diffusive has the keeping of *the general faith of Christians, first received from Christ and his Apostles, and preserved by all Bishops in their respective Diocesses, and in the minds and actions of each faithful Believer in the whole Catholick Church*. Strange! that our Jesuire should now at last turn a meer Blackloist, or Traditionary Divine. This general Faith of Christians he compares to *the common Laws of the Land*, to shew I suppose his skill in the Law, and make *the learned Gentlemen of the Temple* to pity or scorn The Master's ignorance: well let that be as it will, for I pretend to no skill in Laws, but as for this *general Faith of Christians*, whatever it be like, I would gladly learn from the Church diffusive, what it is ; for I matter nothing else, but the General Faith of Christians ; but how to learn this, he has not told us ; *it is preserved*, he says, *by all Bishops in their respective Diocesses, and in the minds and actions of each faithful Believer in the whole Catholick Church*.

Well

Well then, must we examine all Bishops and every particular Believer about this? this is impossible to be done: will any one Bishop, or any one particular Believer, (since every Bishop, and every particular Believer has it) suffice to tell us, what this general Faith of Christians is? is this an infallible Conveyance of the Faith to depend upon the Tradition of Bishops and Christian People? is there no faithful and authentick Record of this Faith, from whence we may learn, what Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church? So one would think by this Jesuit's account, who takes no notice of the Holy Scriptures, as if the common Faith of Christians could not be learnt from them, but from the tradition of the Church diffusive.

Thus much for Common Law, but the Church has her Statute Laws too, and they are *the Decisions or Canons* of General Councils, *declaring and applying to particular Instances the Common Law and Belief of the Church*: but how does the Pope and a General Council, or the Church representative, as he calls it, come to have the power of declaring, and applying the common Faith of Christians, which is in the keeping of the Church diffusive, and therefore one would think, could be declared by none else? do the Pope and a General Council infallibly know the Sentiments and Opinions of all the Christian Bishops and People in the World? This they must do, or else they cannot declare the common Faith of Christians, unless they can infallibly declare, what they do not know: If their Authority be only to declare the common Faith of Christians, how shall we know, that they declare nothing but the common Faith of Christians? for if they do, their Decrees are not valid, for they declare that which is false.

This Jesuit has greatly intangled and perplexed the Cause by laying the whole stress upon *the declarative and*
apply.

A Vindication of the First Part of

applying Power. Had he said, that the Pope and a General Council had Authority to declare what is the Christian Faith, and though they declared that to be the true Faith, which the Church diffusive never heard of before, yet after their decision, it must be received as the common Faith of Christians, though it had not been so formerly, there had been some sense in this, though no truth: but when he says the Church can only declare what is, and always has been the common Faith of Christians, if I can find by ancient Records, that what the Council declares to be the common Faith of Christians now, was either not known or condemned in former Ages; if I certainly know, that she declares that to be the Faith, which at the very time of the Council was so far from being the common Faith of Christians, that it was not the common Faith of the Council; but was contradicted by the wisest and best part of it; then I certainly know, that the Council has not declared the common Faith of Christians, and therefore that its Decrees are of no Authority.

But he proceeds. *We hold, that this general Faith received from the Apostles, and preserved in all the Members of the Catholick Church, explained upon occasion by the Church representative, is infallibly true, and this is all the Infallibility the Catholick Church pretends to.* And there is no Protestant but will own this Infallibility. That the Faith at first received from the Apostles, the same Faith, which was delivered by the Apostles, preserved in all the Members of the Catholick Church, and the same Faith explained upon occasion by the Church representative, so that it is evident after the explanation, that it is the same Faith still; I say, every Protestant will acknowledge, that this Faith is infallibly true; for we believe the Faith delivered by the Apostles to be infallibly true, and if it appears, that the same Faith is still taught by the Church, whether in or out of Council it matters not,

not, it must be infallibly true still. But yet there is a little difference between us and the Jesuit; He believes, and would have us believe, that the present Faith of the Church of Rome, viz. the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, is that Faith, which was received from the Apostles, preserved in all the Members of the Catholick Church and only explained upon occasion by the Council of Trent, which was the Church representative; this we deny: this we know, this we can, and often have proved to be false. And I beseech you, what greater infallibility can any Church pretend to, than to have the World receive all her Decrees as infallibly true?

But they do not pretend, that either the whole Church, or any person, or persons in it, are held to possess any intrinsic Infallibility, which they own to be proper to God alone. Thank 'em for nothing, they do not believe, that the Church or Pope or Council are by nature infallible, for all the World would laugh at them, if they did. We do not say, (as he adds) that they cannot of themselves deceive us, but that God according to his Promise directing them by his infallible Spirit, it cannot possibly happen, that they should deceive us. The Modesty of a Jesuit! who claims no more Infallibility for the Pope and General Council, than the Apostles had, and wonders any man should grudge them this, since they do not pretend to an *intrinsic Infallibility*, not to be infallible by Nature, but only by Grace. Thus he adds, that they do not pretend to new Revelations and Lights, nor admit any new Article of Faith; though where a doubt arises the Church hath infallibly power to declare what hath been revealed by Christ to the Apostles, and preached by them, which perhaps some part of the Church might have had a less clear understanding thereof; but this is done, not by making any new Article of Faith, but more clearly delivering what was ever believed by the Apostles, and all Catholicks from their time to this: That is to say, what

A Vindication of the First Part of

what ever the Church determines, though the Christian Church in former ages knew nothing of it, yet it must not be called a new Article of Faith, but a declaring what had been revealed by Christ to his Apostles, and preached by them, though the world had long since forgot it: what ever the Church determines to day, we must believe to have been the Faith of the Apostolick Age, though there are no other evidences nor symptomes of it, but because the Church which is infallible says so. And this is all the Infallibility the Church pretends too! a very small matter to be denied her by Christians, it is only to believe what ever she says, without disputing or examining her Faith; nay to believe that to be the old Faith, which the most authentic Records of the Church prove to be new. I have thus stept out of my way, to see what fine thing he had to say of the Churches Infallibility, which he promised a very favourable representation of; but it is all the old cant still, a little disguised by some ignorant blunders, or artificial Non-sense; as for his proofs of this Infallibility, I am not concerned with them at present, and after so many discourses on that Argument they need no answer.

Another Argument whereby I proved, that no man can be disputed into Popery, which denies us the use of our own Reason and Judgment in matters of Religion, was this, *Because it is impossible by Reason to prove, that men must not use their own Reason and Judgment in matters of Religion*: For to dispute is to appeal to Reason, and to dispute against the use of Reason in Religion, is to appeal to Reason against the use of Reason: in Answer to this he tells us, *That men must use their Reason to come to this knowledge, that God hath revealed what they believe*. Now I would desire no more but this to prove that we must use our Reason in matters of Religion: for no man at this day can know what is revealed without it. I do assert, and let him disprove me when he can, that since God
has

has given us reason to judge of the truth or falshood of such things, as are knowable by the light of Nature, and a standing Rule of Faith and Manners in the writings of the Old and New Testament, for matters of Revelation, we must believe no Mans or Churches pretences to Infallibility, who either teaches any Doctrine, which plainly contradicts the light of Reason, or a standing revelation; and therefore we must judge of mens pretences to the Spirit, by the Doctrines they teach, and therefore must particularly judge of their Doctrines too: This is the fair state of the Controversie between us, and here I leave it, and let him take it up again, when he pleases.

And here he returns back to the Conference between a sturdy Protestant and a new Convert, which belonged to the former head, the design of which is to shew the new Convert, that by going over to the Church of Rome he has gained no more Infallibility, than a Protestant has, nay has lost some degrees of certainty, which he might have had before: for thus the Protestant tells him: *You rely on your own reason and judgment for the Infallibility of your Church, and consequently of all the Doctrines of it, and therefore your infallible Faith is as much resolved into your own fallible Judgment, as the Protestant Faith is: So that the difference between us is not, that your Faith is infallible, and ours fallible, for they are both alike, call it what you will, fallible or infallible----- We have more rational certainty than you have, and you have no more infallible certainty than we. You think you are reasonably assured your Church is infallible, and then you take up your Religion upon trust from your Church, without, and many times against Sense and Reason, according as it happens. So that you have only a general assurance of the Infallibility of your Church, and that no greater than Protestants pretend to in other cases, viz. the certainty of Reason and Argument, but have not so much as a rational assurance of the truth of your particular Doctrines, that if you are mi-*

A Vindication of the First Part of

taken about the Infallibility of your Church, you must be miserably mistaken about every thing else, which you have no other evidence for. But now we are in general assured, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and in particular assured, that the Faith which we profess, is agreeable to Scripture, or expressly contained in it, and does not contradict either Sense or Reason, nor any other principle of Knowledge: so that we have as much assurance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the Infallibility of your Church, and therefore at least have double and triple the assurance that you have.

I have repeated this at large, that the Reader might see what the dispute is, and indeed the very repetition of it is a sufficient justification, for it carries its own evidence along with it. Now as to what I said, that we are in general assured, that the Scriptures are the Word of God. To this he answers, *The conclusion would be this, Catholics are as certain of the sense of Scripture, as Protestants are that they have the letter.* Now I believe any Reader will be as much puzzled to guess, how this comes in, or what relation it has to this dispute, as I am. I tell the new Convert, that his old Protestant Friend has as much certainty of his Religion as he has; for tho' he flatters himself with the conceit of an infallible Church, yet his belief of the Churches Infallibility is founded only on Reason and Argument, as the Protestant Faith is, and therefore his Faith is no more infallible than the Protestant Faith is, and so far they are equal. But then I add, that the Protestant has at least as good assurance, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, as the Papists can pretend to have, that the Church is infallible, and so far they may be allowed equal still, that the one thinks he has an infallible Guide, the other an infallible Rule of Faith: Now how can the Jesuit's conclusion come in here? *Catholics are as certain of the Sense of Scripture, as Protestants are,*

are, that they have the Letter. For the comparison did not lie between the Sense and the Letter of Scripture, but between that Evidence Papists have of the Infallibility of their Church, and Protestants have, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; both which is not infallible, but a rational Evidence, and therefore so far equal: and this he has nothing to say to. In the *Preserv. Confid.* p. 29. he represents it otherwise: *This is the case; On one side there is supposed an infallible Interpreter of the Christians great Law-Book, (for thus Dr. Sherlock states the case) on the other are some men (far the greater part unlearned and weak) who allow not any Sense to this Book, which seems to them to contradict their Sense or Reason, or any other principle of their Knowledge. And I am asked, Whether I proceed more prudently in receiving the Sense of the Law from that Interpreter (which is actually supposed infallible) or in proceeding by the second Method.* Now this is as wide of the mark as t'other; I never suppose an infallible Interpreter; never make any dispute, whether I should submit to an infallible Interpreter, or follow my own Reason; which were indeed a ridiculous question, supposing the Interpreter were actually infallible; but our only dispute was, Whether a man, who by the appearing evidence of Reason, is persuaded to believe an infallible Judge, believes more infallibly than a Protestant does, who believes also upon the evidence of Reason and Argument? This is the Question he cannot answer, and therefore would lose, if he could.

But then I added, that Protestants had much the advantage of Papists, because besides that general assurance they had, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and the infallible Rule of Faith, they are in particular assured, that the Faith they profess is agreeable to the Scripture, or expressly contained in it, and does not contradict either Sense or Reason, nor any other Principle of Knowledge;

A Vindication of the First Part of

whereas Papists have no other evidence for the particular Articles of their Faith, but the infallible Authority of their Church, which is the last resolution of their Faith, and that many times in contradiction to Sense, and Reason, and Scripture, as far as fallible men can judge of it: *So that we have as much assurance of every Article of our Faith, as they have of the Infallibility of their Church*: The meaning of which is, that we have a rational assurance of every Article of our Faith in particular, as they think, they have the assurance of Reason and Argument, that their Church is infallible. To which he answers, *If he means, they have the same proofs for this, which Catholics have for the Infallibility of the Church----- it is false*. No, Sir, I do not mean the same, for I hope they are better, but proofs of the same kind, *i. e.* from Reason and Argument, which are the only proofs they can pretend to, for the Infallibility of their Church; and therefore our Assurance (for that I said, not Proofs) is of the same kind too, a moral rational Assurance, not infallible, for that they have not for Infallibility itself, as our Answerer confesses above.

But the Argument he hints in his Answer, *p. 5.* is so very new, and so very pretty, that I cannot pass it: *If he means, they have the same proofs for this, which Catholics have for the Infallibility of the Church, that is, for the being of that Church which declares her self Infallible (for a Church erring in such a point, would cease to be the Church of Christ) then 'tis evidently false*. The Argument is this, that the Infallibility of a Church, which declares herself infallible, is as evident as the being of that Church; for if she declares her self infallible, and is not infallible, such an Error as this makes her cease to be the Church of Christ. So that the Church of Rome is either an infallible Church, or no Church: Well, for Argument's sake, we will say she is no Church, and try then, how he can

can prove her Infallibility. - But he has another bold stroke in what follows: That *the Christians of this Age have the same evidence of Her* (he must mean the Church of Rome) *being the Church of Christ, and of her teaching Truth, and consequently of her Infallibility, which she hath of Christ; viz. Prophecy, Miracles, &c.* What will no less evidence serve his turn? - is it full as evident, that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ, and speaks Truth, and consequently is Infallible (which it seems every one that speaks truth must by consequence be) as that there was such a person as Christ, the true Prophet and Messiah? I hope by Prophecies, he does not mean the Revelations of St. John, nor by Miracles, the School of the Eucharist.

His next exception is against that Argument: *If you must not use your Reason and private Judgment, then you must not by any Reason be persuaded to condemn the use of Reason; for to condemn is an act of Judgment, which you must not use in matters of Religion: So that this is a point which no man can dispute against, and which no man can be convinced of by disputing, without the reproach of self contradiction.* Here our Jesuit is as pleasant as his wit would serve him; the sum of his Answer is, That a man may be convinced by Reason, that he ought to choose a Guide, and not to trust his Reason in all things. I readily grant it, for this is to use our Reason; but the inquiry is, Whether Reason can convince any man, that he ought to follow this Guide in contradiction to his own Sense and Reason: whether because Reason will direct a sick man to choose a Physician, it will direct him also to submit to this Physician when he certainly knows that he gives him Poison.

The next Principle, which overthrows the use of common Sense and Reason (for that is his charge against me) is this, *That we must allow of no Reason against the Autho-*

rity

rity of plain and exprefs Scripture. This he allows to be a true Catholic Principle; and therefore I hope the Principle does not overthrow common Sense, unless Catholic Principles may do it. But he does not like an instance or two I give of it in the first and second Commandments: I say, such an exprefs Law is that, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* No reason in the World can justify the worship of any other Being, good or bad Spirits besides God, because there is an exprefs Law against it, and no Reason can take place against a Law. A rare consequence (says the Jesuit) to infer a Negative from an Affirmative antecedent. But I thought, *Him only shalt thou serve*, had signified thou shalt serve none but him; and that I think excludes all other Beings from any share in our Worship. Now to take his own instance, were there such a Law, that a Subject should love his King only, this would exclude Father or Wife, or any other Friends or Relations from a share in our love. Here he begins to distinguish between that worship they pay to Creatures, and to God, and alleadges St. *Austin's* Authority for it; but if he have a mind to renew that Dispute about the sense of the Primitive Fathers, as to Invocation of Saints, he knows his man, and had best keep to him, or at least do him right, before he engages any farther. It had been more to the purpose, to have examined that explication I gave of the first Commandment, and how I proved, that it is an exprefs Law against the worship of any other Being, but the Supreme God, but what is most to the purpose, is seldom most to his purpose.

Answ. to Pre-
serv. p. 6.

The next instance I gave of this rule was the second Commandment: *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image*; and there the Jesuite stops with an *Ec.* for he durst not trust good Catholics, who might read his paper, though they will read nothing else, with the whole Commandment; and this I affirmed, and affirm still, is an exprefs

pref's

press a Law against Image-Worship, that no reason must be admitted for it. What (says he) if you be told, that although the Jews had perhaps a command of making no graven Image, &c. again why not and not to worship it; we do not say they were forbid to make any graven Image, but they were forbid to make them for worship; and therefore his following instances of Bezaleel and Solomon, who made no Images or likenesses of things in Heaven or Earth for worship, are nothing to the purpose; he adds, yet this being a positive Law, and not confirmed in the Gospel, doth not oblige us; will this reason be admitted? He answers for me, No; but I answer yes, if it be true and he dare stand to it; but this is no reason against an express Law, but an exception to the Law itself, as of no force. I do affirm, that if the second Commandment be still in force, it does so expressly condemn all Image-worship, that no reasons can justify Image-worship against such an express Law; but if it be a Law no longer, the case I confess is altered, and I desire to know, whether he will stand to this; but he had best advise with some wiser men first, who understand the sense of the Church and of the Fathers, and of their own Divines a little better about this matter. But before they abrogate this Law, I would desire them to make it a Commandment by it self, and call it the second Commandment, as we do, for fear of abrogating the first Commandment with it, of which they make it a part: though the truth is, the Church of Rome could spare them both, and thank you too.

*His parting blow is a very terrible one. I direct Pro- Presby. Part L
restants never to admit any Arguments merely from the use- P. 44 45
fulness, convenience, or pretended necessity of any thing, to prove
that it is. As for instance: A supreme Oecumenical Bishop
and an Infallible Judge of Controversies, are thought absolutely
necessary to the Unity of the Church, and certainty of
Faith, and confounding of Schisms and Heresies.----- Now if*

A Vindication of the First Part of

I thought all this were true (as I believe not a word of it is) I should only conclude, that it were great pity that there is not an Universal Pastor, and Infallible Judge Instituted by Christ; but if you would have me conclude from these Premises, Ergo, there is an Universal Pastor and infallible Judge, I must beg your pardon for that; for these Arguments do not prove that there is such a Judge, but that there ought to be one, and therefore I must conclude no more from them. This, he says, is not only to misuse humane Reason, but to deny Wisdom and Reason in God; Alphonsus the Royal Mathematician, was ever looked on as guilty of a horrid Blasphemy, for having said he thought he could have ordered some things better than God did, at the first Creation. 'Tis one of as deep a dye, to think God ought to have done, what we believe, that he hath not done.

But do I any where say, that God ought to have done, what I believe he has not done? do I any where say, that God ought by necessary and infallible means to have prevented Schisms and Heresies? Dare our Author himself say this, who assigns this as the reason, why *the Infallibility of the Church is no more than morally evident*, because otherwise it were impossible that any Heresie should be: which at least supposes, that God did not intend to make it impossible, that there should be Heresies and Schisms; and therefore though we should grant it absolutely necessary to prevent all Heresies and Schisms, that there should be an Oecumenical Pastor and Infallible Judge; is this to grant it necessary, that there should be one, or to say, that there ought to be one, unless I had said also, that it were absolutely necessary that all Heresies and Schisms should be prevented? Is there no difference between saying, that such a thing is absolutely necessary to such an end, and to say, that such an end is absolutely necessary.

But however, where do I say, that God has not done that,

that which I believe he ought to have done? is it the same thing to say, such a thing is not, and such a thing is not proved by such an Argument? and yet this is the utmost that I say, that the supposed necessity of an infallible Judge, does not prove, that there is such a Judge, but only that there ought to be one, and I must conclude no more from it; and does this overthrow the use of Reason, to conclude no more from an Argument, than the Argument will prove? whatever any man apprehends necessary, to be sure, he is mightily inclined to believe, but whoever will believe like a reasonable creature, must have good evidence for what he believes, and yet that we believe it necessary is no evidence, that it is; not that God will not do, what is necessary to be done, but because that may not be necessary, which we vainly and presumptuously imagine to be so: which is the very reason I assign for it in the words immediately following. *Indeed this is a very fallacious way of reasoning: because what we may call useful, convenient, necessary, may not be so in itself; and we have reason to believe it is not so, if God have not appointed, what we think so useful, convenient, or necessary: which is a truer and more modest way of reasoning, than to conclude, that God has appointed such a Judge, when no such thing appears, only because we think it so useful and necessary, that God ought to do it.* Which is not to excuse a bad Saying with a good one, as the Jesuite pretends in answer to the Footman, (*Preservat. Consider.* p. 36.) but to justify a good Saying with a good Reason. But if it were such blasphemy in *Alphonsus* to say, that *he thought he could have ordered some things better than God did at the first Creation*, let the Jesuite consider what it is, to mend what God has done in the work of our Redemption, upon a meer supposition, that it may be mended: for Popery is nothing else but a mending; or more properly speaking, a corrupting the Gospel of Christ with a blasphemous

mous opinion of mending it. And I think to say, that God has done, what there is no other proof he has done, but only that we think he ought to have done it, is to say, that God ought to have done, what it does not appear he has done; and if not to be, and not to appear, be the same in this case, then this is equivalent to saying, that God ought to have done, what he has not done. And this I hope is sufficient for the Vindication of those Principles, which are pretended to overthrow the Use of Common Sense and Reason.

S E C T. II.

The Principles pretended to make void all Faith vindicated.

Answer to Preface, p. 6.

HE begins with proving the Protestant Faith, not to be a *Divine Faith*, because it is not a *certain one*; which if it were true, is like proving a man not to live, because he is weak: for if there be as much certainty, as is absolutely necessary to the essence of Faith, it may be a true Faith, though weak, as a weak man is alive still: and Faith receives its denomination of Divine or Humane Faith, not from the Certainty or Uncertainty of it, but from the Authority on which it rests; a Divine Authority makes a Divine Faith, Humane Authority an Humane Faith, and both these may be either certain or uncertain, or, to speak properly, strong or weak: so that to prove, that the Protestant Faith is not *Divine*, because it is not *Certain*, is like disproving the Essential Properties by Changeable Accidents, that a Man is not a reasonable Creature, because he is not strong: for there is no more necessary connexion between Faith being Divine, and being Strong or Certain, than between Reason and Bodily

ly Strength; a weak Man may be a reasonable Creature, and a weak Faith may be Divine, if it be founded on a Divine Authority.

But I wish the Jesuite had told us, what that degree of Certainty is, which makes a Faith *Divine*, whether any thing less than the certainty of Infallibility can do it; for this used to be the old Argument, that our Faith is not Divine nor Certain, because it is not infallible, but if they will abate any thing of Infallibility, we will vie all other degrees of Certainty with them, and that he very fairly quitted before, when he owned and proved, that there could be no more than Moral Evidence for the Infallibility of their Church, and then I am sure, they can have no more than a Moral Evidence for the rest of their Faith, which is all founded upon their Churches Infallibility.

Well, having proved, that our Faith cannot be Divine, because it is not certain, he next undertakes to prove, that our Faith is not certain: because *we cannot have an Act of Faith of any One Article, till our Rule of Faith proposes it, i. e. till we know certainly what Scripture teaches of it, not by any one Text, but by comparing all the Texts that speak of that Subject.* Very well, we cannot believe any thing upon the Authority of Scripture, which is our Rule of Faith, till we know, that it is in Scripture; wisely observed, and we grant it. Let us see, what follows. 1. *Then a Protestant must certainly know, that he hath all the Books of Holy Writ.* 2. *That all those, he owns for such were really written by inspired Pens.* The second we accept of, but there is no need to submit to his first Condition. That a Protestant must certainly know, that he hath all the Books of Holy Writ; that is, he must be able to prove, that there never were any other Books written by the Apostles or other inspired Men, but what we receive into our Canon of Scripture; which is to

A Vindication of the First Part of

prove a negative, which is always thought unreasonable, and at this distance from the Apostolick Age is impossible, but whenever the Church of *Rome* will prove this of their Canon of Scripture, we will prove it of ours. In the mean time it is sufficient, that we reject no Books, which have been always acknowledged by the Universal Church, and that the Books we receive have been received for inspired Writings by the Universal Church; and if ever there were any other Books written by the Apostles or Evangelists, which are now lost, we have reason to believe, that the Church does not need them, but has a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners without them; for the Divine Providence would never permit, that the Church should want any necessary part of the Rule of Faith.

He proceeds. 3ly. *And (since the Letter kills) that he understands the true sense of each Text which relates to the Object of that Act of Faith.* 4ly. *That he remember them all, so as comparing them, to see which is the clearer to expound the obscurer, and what is the result of them all, (for any one he understands not, or hath forgotten, may possibly be that one that must expound the rest) he cannot have one Act of Faith.*

Now, not to take notice of his ridiculous, not to say blasphemous, misapplication of Scripture in that Parenthesis, *the Letter kills*, by which St. Paul understands the Law, which he calls the *Letter*, or an External Administration, and the *Ministration of Death, and of Condemnation*, in distinction from the Gospel, which is the *Ministration of the Spirit, and the Ministration of Righteousness*, 2 Cor. 3. 6, 7, 8, 9. but our learned Jesuite understands it of the Letter of the Gospel as distinguished from the Sense of it, which is such a distinction as no men of sense ever thought of, till the Church of *Rome* found it necessary to distinguish the Letter and the Words of Scripture from

from the Sense of it, and to separate them too, which they have effectually done; but yet how the Letters, which are very innocent things in all other Books, should be such killing things in Scripture, is worthy of the Wit and Learning of a Jesuite to unriddle: But I say, to let this pass, I grant a Protestant must understand the true sense of Scripture (which must be done by venturing to understand the killing Letter of it) before he can know, much less believe, what the Scripture teaches; but that they should understand and remember every place of Scripture which relates to such a Subject, I see no reason for; if we have one or two or more plain and express places for it, it is enough, at least for ordinary Christians, and a great deal more than the Church of *Rome* has for any of her new Articles of Faith. For we are sure, what is plainly and expressly said in one place cannot be contradicted by another; and therefore if I had no more than that one plain Text, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, I should think it a sufficient Proof against the Worship of Saints and Angels, though there were no other Text in the Bible against it. Now whatever Papists say (for we desire to hear them prove as well as say) this is so far from being *impossible to any, or almost any man*, that every considering Protestant has sufficient assurance of all this to found a Divine Faith on.

Well, but *what says Dr. Sherlock to give Protestants any certainty?* Truly not one word, for that was not my business to shew what positive certainty Protestants have, but to shew upon what vain pretences Papists charge the Protestant Faith with uncertainty.

And 1. I observe, *that could they prove the Protestant Faith uncertain, this is no sufficient reason to turn Papists, because Protestants are uncertain, does this prove the Church of Rome to be infallible, because the Church of England is* *Preservat.*
fal. P. 79.

fallible? must certainly be necessarily found amongst them, because it is not found with us? is Thomas an honest man, because John is a knave? Yes, he says, if the stolen goods were found with John, an honest Jury he conceives would bring Thomas in not guilty. And if Protestant Uncertainty, and Popish Infallibility, were to be decided by an honest Popish Jury, we might guess pretty near at their Verdict. But he says, *there is a true Faith, and consequently a certain Rule of Faith. Protestants on one side chuse one Rule, viz. the Holy Scriptures, for we have no other Rule; Catholicks another; therefore not the Holy Scriptures, for that is the Protestant Rule: but here he ignorantly misrepresents his own Church; for the Church of Rome does own the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith, though not a compleat and perfect Rule; but the dispute between Protestants and Papists, is not so much about the Rule, as about the Judge; but he seems not to understand this distinction between the Rule and the Judge of Faith. But now for his conceiving! I conceive then, that if the Protestant Rule be proved uncertain, (that is, the Holy Scriptures) 'tis plain, the Catholick Rule must be the certain one. But when the Scriptures are proved uncertain, I fear, there will be no Rule at all. But however, his Argument is so far true, that if he could prove, that there are but two Rules, that one is false, and the other true; then when he has proved one to be false, I grant without any more disputing, that the other is true: but now, though there can be but one true Rule, there may be a great many false ones, and then both the Rules in competition may be false and uncertain. In the *Preservat. Consider.* p. 38. he endeavours to salve this; and now does not put the question about two Rules of Faith, for that he says, we are agreed on. *That the Scriptures are the Word of God, that if we understood the full extent of its sense and meaning, there would never*
*be**

be Error or Hereſie amongſt us. Which ſhews, that, as I obſerved before, he did not underſtand the difference between a Rule of Faith, and a Guide or Expoſitor, till ſome wiſer man had told him of it. Well, now *the thing in queſtion is, by what method we ought to come to that knowledge, as far as it is neceſſary to a Chriſtian.* And I ſay, that all the methods are reduced to theſe two heads: that we are guided to the certain knowledge of what God hath revealed; either by a knowledge communicated to each of us, or by a knowledge communicated only to Guides appointed to direct the reſt. What he means by this communicated knowledge I cannot tell; for we think the Scriptures may be underſtood without either publick or private Enthuſiaſms, as all other Books are to be underſtood, by conſidering the uſe and ſignification of words, the ſcope and deſign of the place, and by comparing one Text with another, and the like: Thus the Guides of the Church muſt underſtand Scripture, and by their aſſiſtance thus private Chriſtians may underſtand Scripture. This all Mankind confeſs to be one way of underſtanding Scripture, the ſame way that all men uſe to underſtand any Writing, nay the only natural way, that we know of: No, ſays the Church of *Rome*, there is another poſſible way, for God to direct the Guides, the Pope of *Rome*, or General Council by an infallible Spirit in expounding Scripture: right ſay I, this is poſſible indeed, for God can do it, if he pleaſes, but it does not follow, this is any way at all, till it appears, that God has revealed, that he will take this way: ſo that before there can be any competition between theſe two ways of expounding Scriptures, it muſt be proved, that there are two ways; the Proteſtant way is acknowledged by all Mankind, for Nature teaches no other way of underſtanding Books, whether of Humane or Divine Compoſition; that there is ſuch a way as the Popiſh Method muſt be proved by Revelation,
for

for it depends wholly upon the Will of God, and therefore can be proved only by Revelation: now to make a competition between two ways of expounding Scripture, before it is proved there are two ways is ridiculous; and much more ridiculous to prove the certainty of the unknown and unproved way, from the uncertainty of the known way: if they can prove, the Protestant way of expounding Scripture, which is the only way we know of, to be uncertain, the consequence is, that there is no certain way of expounding Scripture, not that the Church of *Rome* is the infallible Interpreter of Scripture: and therefore any Protestant who is persuaded to own the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, because he is told, that the Protestant Faith is uncertain, is a very foolish Convert, and has so little sense and reason, that it were fit, he had an infallible Guide, if he were to be found.

So that he is a little too forward, when he says, that *all the Methods* (of coming to the knowledge of Scripture) *are reduced to these two heads*, for we know, but of *one* way of expounding Scripture, till he proves another; and when he can prove his infallible Guide, we will give up Protestant certainty, as I told him before, but till he has in another way proved the infallible Authority of his Church in expounding Scripture, though he could prove our Faith uncertain, this cannot prove his own to be infallible.

In the next place I directed our Protestant to ask these Popish Disputants, *what they meant by the uncertainty of the Protestant Faith.* For this may signifie two things, either, 1. *That the Objects of our Faith are in themselves uncertain, and cannot be proved by certain reasons.* Or, 2ly, *That our persuasion about these matters is uncertain and wavering.* The Jesuite answers, that this is not a true division, for *there is a third thing also, to wit, that what-*
ever

ever Reasons there may be for a thing, he who believes it, hath for the motive of his belief those certain Reasons.---For he that believes in Christ only because his Mother hath taught him so, hath a very uncertain, and no Divine Faith. But suppose this Mother be the Church, and he believes it only, because the Church hath taught him so, Has this man a divine and certain Faith? No doubt must our Jesuite say, because the Church is Infallible. But suppose this man can no more prove the Church to be infallible, than that his natural Mother is infallible; What difference is there between those, who believe upon the Authority of the Church, and of their Mother? I can assign none, and shall be glad to learn the difference from our Jesuite. He who believes the true Christian Faith, and lives in conformity to it, shall certainly be saved, or else I fear we must at least damn half the Christians in the World, whether Protestants or Papists, for want of understanding the reasons of their Faith. Nay I am afraid all Traditionary Christians must be damned, who believe this is the true Faith to day, because their Fathers and Mothers were taught so and believed so yesterday. So that I guess upon second thoughts our Jesuite will compound this matter with me, and let fall the third part of the division, and I am contented at present, till I hear farther from him.

But he might have observed that I said, not only that *the Objects of our Faith are in themselves certain, but that they may be proved by certain Reasons.* And therefore for him to say, that *they are indeed in themselves certain, but not to any Protestant, whose Rule of Faith cannot make him certain of any one Article,* without offering to shew, that the Reasons, why we believe are uncertain, is to drop half of the first branch of the division, and then to complain of the want of it. When the Footman had minded him, that our Rule of Faith is the Scripture, and therefore if what he says be true, the Scripture cannot make us certain of

any one Article of Faith, instead of answering this Blunder, his Superiors only correct his Words in a Parenthesis, *Preserv. Confid.* p. 40. *The Protestant Rule of Faith* (considering the Method he applies it by) cannot make him certain, &c. which is a plain confession, that the Footman was too hard for the Jesuite, but then he should have shewn us, how we had misapplied, and what the uncertainties of our Reasons are, but I suppose, he will take time to consider that.

As for what he calls my Rule of Faith, which he says justifies Turk, Jew, and Gentile. *We believe all that God hath revealed, and nothing else, is not all, that he hath revealed certain?* Though I grant a Divine Revelation is the only Rule of my Faith, yet here I spoke not of the Rule but of the Objects of my Faith, and challenge him to shew, that we do reject any thing that God has revealed in the Gospel of his Son, or believe any thing else; and dare him, as I well might all professed Christians, to deny the truth or certainty of what is revealed in the Gospel: but *Turks and Jews believe what they think in their judgments God hath revealed, that is their Rule, and 'tis yours.* And is there any fault to be found with this so far? Do Papists believe, what they think in their judgments, God has not revealed, or what they think, he has revealed? If they believe, what they think God has revealed, then they justify Jews and Turks too, as much as Protestants. No says the Jesuite, *Your own private judgments are on both hands your Guides, and not any authority established by Almighty God.* Now I confess, I am not ashamed to own, that Turk and Jew and Gentile, that is all Mankind except Papists, agree with Protestants in this, that all men must believe with their own judgments, and that there is no other faculty to believe with: and much good may it do Papists, that they have found out a way to believe without judgment, wherein they differ from the rest of Mankind.

Preservat. Considerd, p. 40.

Mankind. As for *their Authority appointed by God*, on which they must rely without using their own Judgment, when they can prove any such Authority we will submit to it.

I proved that the Articles of the Christian Faith, which Protestants believe, are certain and founded on certain Reasons, as they themselves must grant, unless they renounce the Christian Religion, for here Infallibility itself cannot help them out. *For Infallibility cannot make that certain, which is in its self uncertain, an infallible man must know things as they are, or else he is mistaken and ceases to be infallible, and therefore what is certain he infallibly knows to be certain, and what is uncertain he infallibly knows to be uncertain; for the most certain and infallible Knowledge does not change its Object, but sees it just as it is.* Now this he says is notoriously false, since she (the Church) is not infallible by any light of her own, but by the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. Now this is nothing to the purpose by what light the Church sees, the Question is, Whether an infallible Church can know that to be certain, which is uncertain? if she can, then she infallibly knows that which is not true. But were not the Apostles certain of what Christ told them, when they acknowledged him the Son of God before he gave them certain Reason for it? But was not Christ's telling them so a certain Reason? If they believed without Reason, I am of opinion, how blind an impiety soever it be, that they believed too soon. I envy no Church the privilege of believing infallibly without Reason or Evidence, but it is well for the Church of Rome if she have this privilege, for unless she can be Infallible without Reason, nay in contradiction to it, I am sure, she is not infallible. But what tergiversation is here? Does the Church of Rome infallibly know, that the Christian Religion is certainly true? Does she infallibly know, that the certain Truth of Christian Religion is founded upon certain Reasons? if so,

A Vindication of the First Part of

then the Christian Religion is certain and founded on certain Reasons; and then those who believe the Christian Religion for the sake of such certain Reasons have a certain Faith, whether they believe upon the Authority of the Church or not, unless a Faith built upon certain Reasons may be uncertain, or cannot be certain: for if the Church infallibly knows, that there are certain Reasons for the truth of Christianity, then there are certain Reasons distinct from the Infallibility of the Church, and they may be a Foundation for a certain Faith without the Churches Infallibility.

I observed, that *their great Argument to prove the uncertainty of the Protestant Faith is, that there is a great variety of Opinions among Protestants, and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and assurance.* He says, *I should have added, tho' they use the same Rule of Faith, and apply it by the same means.* But there was no need of adding this, it was supposed in all the Arguments I used, which he answers only by saying, *'Tis an unanswerable Argument against your Rule of Faith, and evidently proves it uncertain.* What does it prove the Scripture to be uncertain? for that is our Rule, or does he mean this of *our Way of applying it*, that is by using the best Reason and Judgment we have to understand it: and then his Argument is this, some men misunderstand Scripture, and therefore no man can rightly understand it; some men reason wrong, and therefore no man can reason right; some men are confidently persuaded, that they are in the right, when they are in the wrong, and therefore no man can be certain when he is in the right: an Argument which in all other cases mankind would hiss at. Some men believe they are awake, when they are in a dream, therefore no man can know, when he is awake: there are silly confident people, who are cheated with slight appearances of things, therefore no man can distinguish between appearances

ances and realities. Or to put but one case, which will sensibly affect him: some men, nay the greatest part of Christians, do not believe the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore no man can be certain, that the Church is Infallible: For here are all his Conditions, *the same Rule, applied the same way*, for he confess'd above that there can be no more than a *Moral Evidence for the Infallibility of the Church*. Now in Moral Evidence every man must use his own Judgment; thus we do, we consider all the Arguments they alledge for the Infallibility of their Church from Scripture, from Promises, from Prophecies, from *Bellarmin's* Fifteen Notes of the Church, or whatever other Reasons and Arguments they use; upon the whole we conclude, that the Church of *Rome* is not Infallible, they that it is: now if he will stand to his Argument, *That variety of Opinions, when men use the same Rule, and apply it the same way, is an unanswerable Argument, that the Rule is uncertain*, then it is impossible that they should have so much as a Moral certainty of Infallibility; since all mankind besides are against them.

His Answer to *Dr. St.'s* Arguments, to prove that the Scriptures may be a very certain Rule, though men differ in expounding them, are so very senseless, that I have no patience to answer them, especially since he grants all that the Dean intended to prove, that a Rule may be a certain Rule, though men, who do not understand it, may mis-apply it. But the principle he has laid down for mine, I confess, is very extraordinary and surprizing, that *if two men have the Bible, read it, endeavour to understand it, and believing they do, draw from the same Scriptures two different Conclusions, two opposite Articles of Faith, both are bound to stand to their private judgment, and to believe themselves in the right, though all the World should accuse them in lieu of the true pretended Rule, to have used a false*
One.

Preserv. Consider'd, p. 42.

One. I affirm, that one man may expound the Scripture right, and know, that he does so, though another expounds it wrong; and he makes me say, that when two men expound the Scripture to different and contrary senses, they are both bound to believe, that they are in the right: this it is certain they will do, and there is no remedy against it, but what is worse than the disease, that men should not use their own Judgments, and then they dare not believe themselves when they are in the right, which is as bad, as to believe themselves in the right, when they are in the wrong: but that for this reason, *all the World should accuse them in lieu of the true pretended Rule to have used a false one*, is very senseless, unless by all the World he means the World of Roman-Catholicks, for no other men, as I have already shewn, nay not he himself, if he will stand to his own word, will accuse the Rule to be false, because men make a false judgment of it; for to call every man's private judgment of the Rule *his Rule*, which is the substance of his following harangue, is to resolve neither to think, nor speak, like other men: for that no man thinks his own private judgment to be his Rule, is evident from hence, that upon better Information he alters his judgment, without changing his Rule.

I concluded this Section concerning the uncertainty of the Protestant Faith with this observation, that *this very Argument from the different and contrary opinions of Protestants to prove the uncertainty of the Protestant Faith, signifies nothing as to our disputes with the Church of Rome: for ask them, what they would think of the Protestant Faith were all Protestants of a mind? would their consent and agreement prove the certainty of the Protestant Faith? then the Protestant Faith in opposition to Popery is very certain, for they all agree in condemning the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome. And thus I think they get nothing by this Argument: for if the dissensions of Protestants proves the*

uncertainty of their Faith, as to such matters wherein they differ, then by the same Rule their agreement in opposition to Popery, shews their great certainty in such matters. And this I suppose is no great inducement to a Protestant to turn Papist.

Our Jesuit had so much Wit in his Anger, as to conceal the force of this Argument, and to represent it thus, *Were all Protestants of a mind would their consent and agreement prove the certainty of the Protestant Faith.* By which alone no man living could guess, what I was proving; and to this he answers, *Not at all,* and I agree with him in it; for meer agreement does not prove the certainty of Faith, no more then meer disagreement, or variety of Opinions proves the uncertainty of Faith. But they prove them both alike, as I observed, which he calls a ridiculous Inference, and as he has reported it, he has made it ridiculous enough, *This is the same Rule, and their disagreement proves not their uncertainty.* This is to mangle and transprose an Argument that it may not be understood: but to confute this he says, *all Union is no Argument of the Spirit of God, for People may combine to do ill:* But what is this to agreement in Opinions? May not that argue the certainty of Faith, because some men agree to do ill? for a general consent and agreement of mens understandings, may be an argument of the truth of what they consent in, though the agreement of their Wills may not be a virtuous but a wicked Combination. But yet *St. Paul assures us, disunion and dissention is a certain mark of the absence of the Spirit of God,* that is, Contentions and Quarrels and Schisms are indeed so far the Works of the Flesh. But when two men or two Churches differ in their opinions of things, can neither of them be in the right? Is the Spirit of God with neither of them? Is truth on neither side? Then the Controversies between the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *England*, prove that the Spirit of God is no more.

more with the Church of *Rome*, then with the Church of *England*.

The plain case is this ; our *Roman* Adversaries perswade Protestants, that they can have no certainty of their Faith, because Protestants are so much divided about it, and therefore they must go to the Church of *Rome*, which alone pretends to Infallibility. But say I, why should these differences among Protestants oblige them to go over to the Church of *Rome*, when Protestants have no difference about this matter, but are all agreed, that the Church of *Rome* is so far from being infallible, that she is a very corrupt Church : I do not say, that the differences of Protestants is a good Argument to prove the uncertainty of their Faith, nor their bare agreement to prove the certainty of it, but I say, one proves as much as t'other, and therefore 'tis a better reason to Protestants not to turn Papists, that all Protestants are agreed, that the Church of *Rome* is not infallible, but has greatly erred, then it is for Protestants to go to the Church of *Rome* for Infallibility, because they differ in some things among themselves ; especially considering that many points they now differ about, will not be reconciled by their going to the Church of *Rome* ; for the same points are as fiercely disputed among them too, as to instance at present only in the *Quinquarticular* Controversie.

CHAP. III.

A Vindication of some Positions, which are pretended to make void all Scripture-proof, all use of Fathers and Councils, and of Civil Charity, and Moral Justice to our Neighbours.

AS for Scripture-proof: I was directing Protestants what kind of Scripture-proof to demand for Transubstantiation: and having shewn that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation does manifestly contradict the evidence of all our Senses and the most necessary principles of Reason, I told them, that it is but reasonable, that the evidence for Transubstantiation should at least be equal to the evidence against it, and therefore they must demand such a Scripture-proof of Transubstantiation, as cannot possibly signify any thing else; or else it will not answer that evidence which we have against Transubstantiation; Pris. p. 72. for sense and reason pronounce Transubstantiation to be naturally impossible; and therefore unless it be as impossible to put any other sense upon Scripture, as it is to reconcile Transubstantiation to sense and reason, there is not such good evidence for Transubstantiation, as there is against it. This he repeats after his usual manner, to take care that no body shall understand what it relates to, or see the force of the Argument; and in answer to it he gives us a new instance of his good will to the Doctrine of the Trinity. He says, *A Text which cannot possibly have another sense,* Answer p. 2. doth not leave it in any one's liberty, who owns Scripture to be an Heretick; therefore the Church produced no such

A Vindication of the First Part of

Text against the Arians or Nestorians; whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr. Sherlock, the Arians and Nestorians were not bound to believe the Trinity and Incarnation of Christ. But did I say, that nothing can be proved but by such express Texts, as it is not possible to understand otherwise? I said, this was necessary to prove any Doctrine which sense and reason declare to be absolutely impossible. And will he say the Doctrine of the Trinity is such a Doctrine? No he says, *Preservative Considered*, p. 45. *But they so appeared to the Nestorians and Arians, and that is the case put by Dr. Sherlock:* but I put no case about meer appearing, but of such palpable contradictions as the sense and reason of all Mankind agree in: as Papists themselves cannot deny, and know not how to justify, without pressing the Almighty Power of God to make good their absurd Imaginations. Now where there is only an appearance of contradiction, where a Doctrine only lies cross to mens natural reason, there such express Texts as do more evidently prove that Doctrine, then that Doctrine does evidently contradict reason, is a sufficient foundation for the belief of it, because in this case there is more evidence for it than against it: and did not the Church alledge such Scripture-proofs for the Trinity? And are there no such Proofs to be alledged? He thinks they did not, because then the *Arians* could not have continued Hereticks; for a Text which cannot possibly have any other sense, doth not leave it in any ones liberty to be a Heretick. But I suppose, he will allow, that I spoke not of a natural but of a moral impossibility; now a moral impossibility of interpreting Scripture otherwise is, when a man cannot reasonably do it without offering manifest violence to the words, and this a wilful and obstinate Heretick may do, how plain and self-evident, how incapable soever the words are of any other possible sense to a reasonable

nable and impartial Inquirer. This principle, I confess, makes void all Scripture-proof of such Doctrines as sense and reason pronounce absolutely impossible, but this is no injury, but the greatest right we can do the Scripture. But I cannot without some indignation observe, how the Doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity is upon all occasions introduced by these men as contradicting sense and reason, which would make one suspect, they kept it for no other reason but to justify the absurdities and contradictions of Transubstantiation.

As for the making void the use of Fathers and Councils to unlearned men, it is the thing I designed, and I am very glad if I have done it : but as for learned men they may make such use of them still, as such Writings are designed for ; not to make them the Rule of Faith, but either to learn what was the Doctrine and Practice of the Church in their days, or what their private Opinions were, or how they expounded Scripture and the like: that I call it *squabbling* about the sense of Fathers, if the expression be undecent, it is owing to himself and some such late Scriblers, whose Disputes have been nothing else but Squables. But I cannot blame him, that he is so angry, that I direct the Protestant to inquire, *Whether such Books were written by that Father, whose Name it bears*, for he knows such an inquiry has very lately cost him dear, I was going to say a blush, but that is impossible. If such Questions as I ask cannot be answered to the satisfaction of learned men, they are of no more use to them, than they are to the unlearned, who cannot answer them themselves, and want the Learning which is necessary to make them capable of a satisfactory Answer, and this is all the Answer I shall return to this Charge.

A Vindication of the First Part of

His next Charge is a dreadful one : *Such Principles as make void all use of Civil Charity and Moral Justice to our Neighbours.* He lays it in the very last Section of the *Preservative, Concerning Protestant Mis-representations of Popery.* Wherein I shewed, how vain and silly this charge was, and he has not one word to say in defence of it. Among other things I observed, that *these men, who complain so much of Mis-representing, endeavour to make the Doctrines of the Church of Rome look as like Protestant Doctrines, as ever they can, as if there were little or no difference between them.*-----*The truth is, the chief Mystery in this late Trade of Representing and Mis-representing is no more but this, to joyn a Protestant Faith with Popish Practices, to believe as Protestants do, and to do as Papists do.* This I gave some few instances of out of the Representers, and shewed that their Faith, as he Represented it, came very near and in some cases was the very same with the Protestant Faith, but their Practice was Popish. How is this contrary to *Civil Charity and Moral Honesty* ? He says it is this, *When a man's exterior Actions are naturally capable of a good and pious meaning, and he ever and clearly declares, that it is his, yet to fasten upon him another opposite design and meaning.* But how does this concern me, who fasten no meaning at all upon their Actions, but only barely relate, what they profess to believe, and what they practice. He instances in two, and let all the World judge, who makes void *Civil Charity and Moral Honesty*, He, or I.

To insinuate, says he, that a Catholick thinks the Virgin Mary more powerful in Heaven than Christ, he tells you, that he says Ten Ave-Maries for one Pater Noster; whereas all that I say is, He (the Papist Represented) believes it damnable, to think the Virgin Mary more powerful in Heaven than Christ, which is Protestant Doctrine. But yet

yet he prays to her oftner than either to God or Christ ; says ten Ave-Maries for one Pater Noster ; which is a *Papish Devotion*. Is here any breach of Moral Honesty in this ? is not all this true ? do I put any sense or interpretation upon this action ? I believe all men will think, that this does more than insinuate, what a belief they have of the power of the Virgin ; and this the Jesuite was sensible of, and therefore says, that I insinuate it, but I will leave it as I did at first, to what judgment all indifferent men will make of it.

In the next place, he says, I charge the *Catholicks with worshipping the visible Species in the Eucharist* : Hear my words again ; *He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and most damnable to worship any Breaden God ; which is spoke like a Protestant : but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the Sacrament, which is done like a Papist*. Here is nothing about worshipping the visible Species in the Eucharist ; but whatever is the Sacrament, they worship, and must do so by the Doctrine of their Church ; if they can make a Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, without the visible Species, then according to their Doctrine, they need not worship the visible Species, if they can't, they must, for they must adore the Sacrament ; and if the Sacrament should prove to be Bread and Wine, not the natural Body and Blood of Christ, and it is strange, if it should not, then I need not tell them what they worship. But those matters have been debated often enough of late.

He concludes with an advice to Protestants, urging the Argument against Scriptures, which I had before done against Fathers. *Amongst Christians, there is not one in an hundred thousand, who understand all Scripture ; and it is morally impossible they should ; and therefore certainly there must be an easier and shorter way to understand Christian Religion,*

Religion than this, or else the generality of Mankind, even of profess Christians, are out of possibility of Salvation. I grant every word of it to be true, if understanding all Scripture, as he puts it, were necessary to Salvation; but the only easier and shorter way is to understand so much of the Scripture as is necessary to Salvation, and let him when he pleases, if he dare venture the Blasphemy of it, prove that this is morally impossible to the generality of Mankind, even of profess Christians.

A
VINDICATION
 OF THE
SECOND PART
 OF THE
 Preservative against **POPERY.**

Here our Jesuite gives me a great many hard Words, but nothing of Argument ; He talks tragically of Calumnies and Misrepresentations, how much he proves of it, unless a bold Accusation must pass for a Proof, I dare leave to every ordinary Reader, who will compare my Book with his. He is much off of his byas here; for I did not dispute directly against any Popish Doctrines, but used such collateral Arguments, as are very evident and convincing to ordinary Readers, but so much out of the road, that the Jesuite could find nothing in his Common-place Book about it, and therefore does not pretend to answer any one *Section* of my Book ; but yet out of every *Section* he picks some single Sayings, and if he meets with an Argument, that he cannot answer, he takes some few words of it, and calls it Galumny and Misrepresentation ; the only way I have to write such an Answer to him, as may be fit to be read, is to give a short Abstract of each *Section* of my Book, and to take notice, where those Passages come in, which he calls Galumnies and Misrepresentations.

SECT. I.

Concerning Idolatry.

4th Matth. 10.Preserv. Con-
sid. p. 61.

I Shewed the great Design of our Saviour was more perfectly to extirpate all Idolatry. To this purpose he has more perfectly instructed us in the Nature of God. To this end he confines all Religious Worship to God alone. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* It is his answer to the Devil, when he tempted him to fall down and worship him; but he gives such an answer, as excludes all Creatures, not only good, but bad Spirits from any share in Religious Worship. For he does not deny to worship him merely because he was the Devil, but because we must worship none but God. Which is as good a reason against the Worship of the most glorious Angels, as of the Devil himself. This he calls a Misrepresentation, and to make it so, first very fillily misrepresents my words, and says, that I charge the Church of Rome, that she doth not pay to God alone, that degree of Worship, which the tempting Devil demanded of Christ. But I say not one word there about the Church of Rome, tho' the application was obvious and he made it for me: but then I do not blame them, that they do not pay that degree of Worship to God, which the Devil demanded of Christ; which was but an inferior degree of Worship, and therefore not proper for the Supreme Deity; but that they pay any degree, how inferior soever, of Religious Worship to Saints and Angels, or any other Being besides God, for that is the import of our Saviour's Answer to the Devil, and answers the pretence of the Church of Rome, that she does not give *latría*, or that Sovereign Worship, which is due to the Supreme God, but only *dulia*, or an Inferior Worship to Saints and Angels; whereas our Saviour's Argument proves, that no degree of Worship is to be given to any but God. He says farther, p. 64. *That Christ, by refusing himself all Worship to God's Enemy the Devil, teaches us to pay none at all to God's Saints and Angels, is an inference that no one but Dr. Sherlock was ever able to make.* Then it seems, I have the honour of inventing a good Argument, which this Jesuite dares not attempt to answer: let him shew me if he can, that to Worship none

none but God, excludes only the Worship of the Devil, not of Saints and Angels.

As a farther proof of this, I add, *Our Saviour denies to Worship him, though the Devil made no terms with him about the kind or degrees of Worship. He does not require him to offer Sacrifice to him, (which is the only Act of Worship the Church of Rome appropriates to the Supreme God) but only to bow down before him, as an expression of Devotion.* This he calls a Misrepresentation, that Sacrifice is the only Act of Worship, which the Church of Rome appropriates to the Supreme God; which is the first time this was called a Misrepresentation; and yet he himself owns, p. 64. that Sacrifice is indeed the only exterior Worship inseparable from latria, and therefore never to be offered to any but God. And is not this what I said? did I deny, that the Church of Rome paid any other Worship to God, but Sacrifice? but I say, and so says our Jesuite, that there is no other external Act of Worship so peculiar to God, that it can be given to no other being, but only Sacrifice; and therefore since the Devil did not demand of Christ to sacrifice to him, he did not demand of him that degree of Worship, which alone the Church of Rome thinks peculiar and appropriate to God, and yet Christ tells us of all other Acts of Worship, which the Church of Rome thinks may be separated from latria, and therefore given to Creatures, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

I added, that to prevent the Worship of Inferior Demons, who were worshipped as Mediators to the Supreme God, God advances his own Son to be the Universal Mediator, and the Supreme and Sovereign Lord of the World, that all Mankind should make their Addresses and Supplications to him, and offer up their Prayers only in his Name, that in him they should find acceptance, and in no other Name. Hence he concludes, that I charge the Church of Rome, (though I did not mention her) that they offer not their Prayers only in the Name of Christ, that in him they may find acceptance. And this he calls a Misrepresentation; and I will venture to be a Misrepresenter for once, and charge them with it: for if they pray to God in the Name and Merits of Saints and the blessed Virgin; if they pray to them to intercede for them with God, as appears in all their Offices, then they do not pray only in the Name of

Christ, nor expect to be accepted only for his sake.

I summed up this Argument thus : Now this being so apparently one end of Christ's coming into the World to suppress the Idolatry of Creature-Worship, and to *confine all Religious Worship to one Supreme Being, in opposition to the many Gods of the Heathens, and to teach us to make our Applications to this One God, by One Mediator*, (this, he says, is another Misrepresentation, that *they make not their Applications to One God by One Mediator*, which is true, if by One he means only One, for they have Many) *in opposition to the Worship of inferior Deities ; can any man imagine, that the Worship of Saints and Angels and the Virgin Mary, can be any part of the Christian Religion?* which is not a direct Proof against the Worship of Saints and Angels, but an Argument from what is likely, fit and congruous, and consistent with our Saviour's design, to root out all remains and all appearances of Idolatry ; which makes it improbable and incongruous to the utmost degree, that Christ should permit the Worship of Saints and the Virgin *Mary*, as it is practised in the Church of *Rome* ; with Temples and Altars and Images, with Solemn Prayers and Vows, and Solemn Processions, which has so much the external appearance of that Idolatrous Worship, which the Heathens paid to their Gods, that there is no visible distinction between them. And if Christ intended to root out Idolatry, it is highly improbable, that he would allow, so much of the external pomp and shew of it, if it were no more : Those who think this may be, may believe the Worship of Saints and Angels to be a Gospel-Doctrine, notwithstanding this Argument ; but such Arguments as these are thought by most men to have some weight in them ; as for instance, That a Man, who is very curious to preserve his Wives Chastity, will not suffer her to receive all Amorous Addresses and Courtships from Strangers, no not from his dearest Friends ; That a Prince, who is so jealous of any Rivals and Partners, as to make it Treason to usurp the meanest of the *insignia Majestatis*, will not suffer the greatest Favourite to wear the Imperial Crown, nor to sit on his Throne, and receive the Addresses and Homage of his Subjects upon the knee. As I observed before, *that how dear soever the Saints are to God, they are but his Creatures, and if Sovereign Princes will not receive their greatest Favourites into their Throne, much less will God.*

This

This is another of his Misrepresentations, that I say, *the Papists, by their worshipping Saints, Angels, and the Virgin Mary, put them in the Throne of God*; but this I do not say, but only that God will not take any of his Creatures into his Throne. But yet if giving Religious Worship placed the Heathen Deities in God's Throne, I would gladly be satisfied, why the Worship of Saints and Angels should not be thought to do the same: I am sure to worship Saints in the same Temple and at the same Altar, and with the same humble Prostrations, and in the very same Prayers, that we worship God, looks very like placing a Favourite on the same Throne with his Prince; but yet this is not the dispute, whether they do so or not, but whether it be not so like it, that it is unreasonable to think, that Christ, who came to root out all Idolatry, will allow or command it.

Another kind of Idolatry the Heathens were fond of, was, the Worship of Images and Pictures, whereby they represented their Gods as visibly present with them. For they wanted some material representations of their Gods, in which they might, as it were, see them present, and offer up their Petitions to them, and court them with some visible and sensible honours.

To cure this kind of Idolatry under the Law, though God forbade the Worship of Images, yet he appoints them to erect a Tabernacle or Temple, where he would dwell among them, and place the Symbols of his Presence, the Mercy-seat, and the Cherubims covering the Mercy-seat; which was a symbolical Representation of God's Throne in Heaven, where he is surrounded with Angels, as the Holy of Holies itself was the Figure of Heaven. Thus under the Law to give them assurance of his presence with them, though they could not see him, he had a peculiar Place for Worship, and peculiar Symbols of his Presence, but no Images to represent his Person, or to be the Objects of Worship.

And here I took notice of that Pretence of the Church of Rome for Image-Worship, that the Cherubims were worshipped by the *Jews*, and particularly answered the Arguments of the late Bishop of *Oxford* to prove it, and it had been worthy of the Jesuite to have made some reply to this, but he was wiser than to meddle with it: among other things, the Bishop had urged *David's* Exhortation to the People to Honour the

Ark, *bow down to or worship his Foot-stool, for it; or he is holy,* 99 *Psalm*, to prove, that the *Jews* worshipped the Cherubims; this I said, was very strange, when he himself, *four Pages before* had told us, *that the Ark was God's Foot-stool, and the Cherubims his Throne*; now suppose *David* had exhorted the people to *Worship the Ark*, which, as he says, *is God's Foot-stool*, how does this prove, that they must *Worship the Cherubims*, which are *God's Throne*: this he calls a misrepresentation, and so it is indeed, and a very gross one too, but it is his own; for he represents this as my Argument against the *Worship* of the Cherubims, that they were commanded indeed to *Worship the Ark*, which was *God's Foot-stool*, but not the Cherubims, which were his *Throne*: whereas I never granted, that by the *Foot-stool* of *God* was meant the *Ark*, but all that I said was, that if the *Ark*, as the *Bishop* affirmed, was meant by *God's Foot-stool*, and the Cherubims were his *Throne*, then though there had been such a Command to worship *God's Foot-stool*, this could not prove the worship of the Cherubims, which in his Divinity were not the *Foot-stool*, but the *Throne* of *God*. This he could not be ignorant of, because I expressly proved, that by the *Foot-stool* of *God* could not be meant the *Ark*, for the *Ark* was in the *Holy of Holies*, which was a figure of *Heaven*; and neither the *Heaven*, nor any thing in it, but the *Earth* is in Scripture called *God's Foot-stool*; as the *Psalmist* expressly applies it to *Zion* and the *Holy Hill*. And this I observed, is a sufficient confutation of his Exposition of the words, *to bow down to, or worship his Foot-stool*; for *Mount Zion* or the *Holy Hill* was not the *Object* of *Worship*, nor *Symbol* of *God's Presence*; but there *God* was present, and that was reason enough to *worship him at his Foot-stool, and at his Holy Hill*, as our *English Translation* reads it.

I added, Suppose the *Jews* were to direct their *Worship* towards the *Mercy-seat*, which was covered by the Cherubims, where *God* had promised to be present, how are the Cherubims concerned in this *Worship*? the *Worship* was paid only to *God*, though directed to *God*, as peculiarly present in that place, which is no more than to lift up our eyes and hands to *Heaven*, where the *Throne* of *God* is, when we pray to him: but, he adds, the very *Image* (for example) of *Christ crucified*, is the *Object* of the *Worship* of *Papists*, which is certainly true; but he should have given my own words. The *Bishop* had

had said, that *bowing to or towards any thing*, was the same thing; this I granted, if they bowed to or towards any thing as the Object of Worship; and therefore had the *Jews* either bowed to or towards the Cherubims as the Objects of their Worship, as the Papists bow to or towards their Images, they had been equally guilty of Idolatry, and the breach of the Second Commandment; but when *bowing to* signifies bowing to an Object of Worship, and *bowing towards* signifies bowing to this Object of Worship, only towards such a place, where he is peculiarly present, this makes a vast difference. And this he calls a Misrepresentation, that I say, *Papists bow to their Images as Objects of Worship*; but this has been so often proved upon them in the several Answers to the Representer and *M. de Meaux* and his Vindicator, that it would be as foolish in me to prove it again, as it is impudent in him to deny it.

But I observed farther, that in the Gospel God has provided a more effectual remedy against Image-Worship in the *Incarnation of his Son*. Mankind have been always fond of some visible Deity, and because God cannot be seen they have gratified their superstition by making some visible Images and Representations of an invisible God: Now to take them off from mean corporeal Images and Representations, which are both a dishonour to the Divine Nature and debase the Minds of Men, God has given us a visible Image of himself; has clothed his own Eternal Son with Humane Nature, *who is the brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person*.---- Now when God has given us a visible Image of himself, his eternal and incarnate Son, whom we may worship and adore, can we think he will allow us to worship material and sensible Images of Wood and Stone? And here the Jesuite finds another Misrepresentation, that *by the Incarnation God is visibly represented to us in our nature, but the Papists not contented with this contrary to the design of God, made man, make and adore other Images of God*. Here he has concealed what my Argument was, but the thing is true: that though God gave us a visible Image of himself to cure the Idolatry of Image-Worship, yet this is still retained and practised in the Church of Rome.

In summing up this Argument, I said, Since it was one main design of Christ's appearance to root out Idolatry, is it credible, that the Worship of Saints and Angels and the Virgin

Mary,

A Vindication of the Second Part of

Mary, the Worship of Images and Reliques, as it is practised in the Church of *Rome*, should be any part of the Christian Worship, or allowed by the Gospel of our Saviour? if Creature-Worship and Image-Worship were so offensive to God, *here is the Worship of Creatures and Images still, and therefore all the visible Idolatry, that ever was practised in the World before.* This is another of his Misrepresentations, but very true. No understanding Papist, that has any modesty, can deny, that they worship Creatures and Images, for that they should be worshipped is determined by their own Councils; now if there be any *salvo* to deliver the Church of *Rome* from the guilt of Idolatry in worshipping Creatures and Images, when the Heathens were Idolaters for doing it, yet here is the visible Worship of Creatures and Images, that is, all that was visible in the Idolatry of the Heathens. This was my Argument to shew how improbable it was, that Christ, who came to extirpate all Idolatry, should still allow the external and visible Worship of Creatures, which if it be not Idolatry, yet is all that was visible in the Idolatry of the Heathens: and it had better become him to have answered this Argument, than to have called it a Misrepresentation.

I observed farther. That the great difference the Papists can pretend between their Worship of Saints and Images, and what the Heathens did, whereby to excuse themselves from Idolatry, notwithstanding they worship Creatures and Images as the Heathens did, is that they have better Notions of the Worship of Saints and Angels and Images than the Heathens had; but I said, whether they had or no, would be hard to prove: *The Pagan Philosophers made the same Apologies for their Worship of Angels and Demons, and Images, which the learned Papists now make, and whether unlearned Papists have not as gross Notions, about the Worship of their Saints and Images, as the unlearned Heathens had is very doubtful, and has been very much suspected by learned Romanists themselves.* This he puts down for another Misrepresentation, though all learned men know it to be true. Had he ever read *Origen* against *Celsus*, he would have known, that that Philosopher had taught the Roman Doctors, how to defend the Worship of Saints and Images, and that the Father had confuted them long since; and had he looked into *Vives* upon *St. Aust. de Civitate Dei*, he would have found

found that learned Man make no great difference between unlearned Christians and Heathens as to these matters, to name no more at present.

I added, *Can we think, that Christ, who came to make a more perfect reformation, should only change their Country-Gods into Saints and Angels and the Virgin Mary, and give new Names to their Statues and Images?* This he calls a Misrepresentation too, tho' it neither represents nor misrepresents any body, that I know of, but only argues, what Christ was likely to do. For had Christ only forbid the Worship of Pagan Gods, and set up the Worship of Saints, it had not been to extirpate Creature-Worship, but only to change those particular Creatures, who were to be Objects of Worship, and instead of the Images of *Jupiter* and *Bacchus* to set up Images to Saints.

Thus I have considered the Misrepresentations charged upon the first *Section* of the *Preservative*; as for his own representation of the Faith and Practice of the Catholicks, as to their Worship, I am not concerned with it. There are a great many late Treatises, wherein those Matters are fully debated. Such as, *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented. The Object of Religious Worship. The Answer to Papists protesting against Protestant Popery.* The late Answers to *M. de Meaux* and his Vindicator; and a Book, which this Jesuite has some reason to know, *The Primitive Fathers no Papists.* And to these I refer my Reader, who needs any farther satisfaction.

SECT. II.

Concerning the great Love of God to Mankind, &c.

HE has found but six Misrepresentations and Calumnies in this *Section*, which is pretty moderate; and some few Arguments against Purgatory, and our recourse to Saints for their Prayers; which he says he has collected, (*not one omitted*) but when I read them over, I could not find any one of them: I confess, it is a very dull and troublesome task to answer him; for he transcribes several Passages out of my Book, without representing their connexion with what goes before or what follows, or without telling, what their fault is, or offering one word to confute them: that whoever will but take the pains
to

to put every Sentence into its proper place, will need no other answer. And this I shall do, as briefly as I can.

Having shewn, what great assurance the Gospel of our Saviour gives us of the love of God to sinners, I came to shew, how irreconcilable the Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints and Angels, as our Mediators with God, is with the Gospel-Notion of God's Love, and that Security it gives us of Pardon, through the Merits and Intercession of Christ.

1. The Doctrine of Purgatory, where the Punishments are as severe as in Hell itself, only of a less continuance, and yet they may last some thousand Years, unless their Friends or the Priests be more merciful to them. This I said was a barbarous Doctrine, and so inconsistent with the Gospel-Account of God's Love, that it is not reconcilable with any Notion of Love and Goodness; *you may call it Justice, you may call it Vengeance, if you please, but Love it is not.* These words he cites as an Argument against Purgatory, without representing on what it is founded, *viz.* that glorious discovery of God's love to sinners in the Gospel of Christ: now if to damn men, whose sins are pardoned, for a thousand or two thousand Years, (for so long sure a man may lie in Purgatory, or else the Pope is a great Cheat for selling Pardons for ten and twenty thousand Years, if no man be in danger of lying one thousand Years in Purgatory) I say, if this be not reconcilable with the Gospel-Notion of God's Love, then Purgatory can be no Gospel-Doctrine. This Argument he never mentions, and never pretends to answer in his *Catholic Doctrine of Purgatory*. He says the Doctrine of Purgatory is God's Justice, tempered with Infinite Mercy: but I desire him to shew me, where this Infinite Mercy is, to torment a humble, penitent, pardoned sinner for some thousand Years in Purgatory? I believe I spoke the sense of Mankind, when I said, *I should rather chuse to fall into nothing, when I die, than to endure a thousand Years torments, to be happy for ever; for humane nature cannot bear the thoughts of that.* This he severely censures, and says, *that man is unworthy ever to see the face of God, who declares with Dr. Sherlock, that did God offer him the eternal possession of himself on this condition; that he should first suffer a thousand years, he would absolutely refuse it.* I wish he had kept to my own words, for I never would suppose so much Blasphemy, as that God should offer the enjoyment of him-

*Preserv. Con-
sid.* p. 68.

Ibid. p. 70.

himself upon such terms, but I am of the same mind still; though I prefer the enjoyment of God before all the World, and would suffer all the Miseries and Calamities of this Life to obtain it, yet a thousand years torment in Purgatory, which is as intolerable as Hell, is a temptation too big for humane Nature; and if most men think as I do, I believe most men will be at a loss to find out the *infinite Mercy* of Purgatory.

I observed, that there are two extravagant Notions whereon the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded.

1. That God may forgive sins, and yet punish us for them, for no man can go into Purgatory according to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, whose sins are not already forgiven, and I appealed to all mankind, how irreconcilable these two are, to forgive and to punish. For *what is it men are afraid of when they have sinned? Is it not that they shall be punished for it? What is it, men desire, when they desire pardon? Is it not, that they may not be punished?* Which shews; that no man thinks, he is forgiven, when he is punished. Here he represents me to say, *That men desire nothing when they ask pardon, but merely not to be punished; which declares, that they value not God's love and favour as Children, but merely fear the lash like Slaves.* But I never said any such thing. Does it follow, that because all men, who desire pardon, desire not to be punished, that therefore they desire no more? and yet pardon in its strict notion signifies only the remission of punishments; that pardoned Sinners shall be rewarded too, is the abundance of Grace through Jesus Christ: but yet I say, the first act of God's love is not to punish, and he who values God's love and favour, in the first place desires not to be punished: for this was the Argument I insisted on, that such a Notion as this, that God pardons Sinners, and yet punishes them some thousand years in Purgatory, is inconsistent with God's goodness declared by his Son Jesus Christ; for no man thinks such a pardon an expression of love, which does not remit the debt nor the punishment. *That it is in our power, as he says, to attain Salvation without suffering in Purgatory, makes Purgatory no more an act of goodness, than Hell is, which it is in our power by the Grace of God to escape too: but the best account he gives of God's goodness with respect to Purgatory is this: That God restores his favour to us, before our hearts be as perfectly converted to him, as his justice might well require: that is, he takes us into his favour, before we have thoroughly repented of our sins and reformed them, but then Purgatory-fire*

Ibid. p. 70.

must expiate the defects of our repentance and reformation : now this is a great deal more and a great deal less than the Gospel teaches us of God's love to Sinners. For the Gospel promises no mercy to any, but to true penitent and reformed Sinners, and therefore to receive men into favour *before their hearts are thus perfectly converted*, (which I suppose he means of an Evangelical not of a Legal Perfection of Conversion, that is, true and sincere Repentance) is more mercy than the Gospel promises ; and to torment such men in Purgatory, who are received to favour, is a great deal less ; and it is somewhat hard to understand the favour of a thousand years punishment, though it may be thought favour to receive Sinners, before they are perfectly converted. And yet he has told the plain truth of the case ; for this is the only thing, that can reconcile men to the thoughts of Purgatory, or make them think it an Act of Grace, that it is in exchange for the pleasures of Sin, which they are so very fond of ; and those who will venture Hell to enjoy their Lusts, may well think it an Act of Grace to turn Hell into Purgatory : but this is not the Gospel representation of God's love to Sinners ; which is to pardon none but true Penitents, and not to punish those in the next World, who are actually pardoned.

I granted, it is something, *To exchange the eternal punishment of Hell, which is due to sin, into the temporal punishment of Purgatory, but asks, Whether it would not have been a more perfect expression of love and goodness to have remitted the temporal punishment also of, it may be, some thousand years torment in Purgatory ? Whether this might not have been expected under a Dispensation of the most perfect Love ? And from that God, who sent his only begotten Son into the World to save Sinners ?* This is the force of the Argument, which the Jesuite conceals, that though Purgatory be more mercy than Hell, yet it does not answer that representation the Gospel makes of God's infinite love and compassion for penitent Sinners through Jesus Christ.

2. I observed, that in Purgatory, God does not only punish those whom he has pardoned, but he punishes for no other reason but Punishments sake. For thus the Roman Doctors tell us, that the Souls in Purgatory are in a state of Pardon, and in a state of perfect Grace, that they suffer the pains of Purgatory not to purge away any remains of Sin, or to purify and refine them, and make them more fit for Heaven, but only to bear the punishment due to Sin, for which they had made no satisfaction while they

they lived : now I dare boldly affirm, this is irreconcilable with any degree of love and goodness : a just punishment respects the guilt of Sin, but there is no guilt when the Sin is pardoned ; to make it an Act of Goodness, it must respect the reformation of the Sinner, which cannot be, when he is in a perfect state of Grace and needs no amendment ; and such punishments as neither respect the guilt of Sin, nor the reformation of the Sinner, are neither just nor good, which is the exact Notion of Purgatory. This he sets down as a Misrepresentation (p. 68.) but does not tell us why : this Doctrine is taught by *Roman Divines*, as I suppose he knows, or if he don't, let him consult *Bellarmin* or such good Catholick Writers.

I summed up this Argument thus : Our Protestant need not dispute much about Purgatory ; let him only ask a Popish Priest, How the Doctrine of Purgatory can be reconciled with that stupendious love of God declared to penitent Sinners in his Son Jesus Christ ? For it is a contradiction to the Notion of Goodness among men, to inflict such terrible punishments in meer Grace and Love, even when the sin is pardoned and the Sinner reconciled, and no longer in a state of discipline and trial. This is the force of the Argument, and here the Jesuite, if he likes it, may try his skill.

Secondly, Another Argument I urged against Purgatory was this, that it destroys or weakens that security the Gospel hath given Sinners of their Redemption from the Wrath of God, and the just punishment of their Sins. And that upon two accounts.

1. As it destroys mens hopes in the Merits of Christ, and the Atonement and Expiation of his Blood. For if the Blood of Christ does not deliver us from the punishment of Sin, what security is this to a Sinner ? Yes, you'll say, *Christ has redeemed us from eternal, though not from temporal punishments*, and therefore penitent Sinners shall not be eternally damned. This he puts down as a Misrepresentation, p. 67. and says, p. 73. *That Christ truly obtained remission from all temporal as well as eternal pain, and that whoever is regenerated by Baptism, he not only is not adjudged to eternal torments, but neither doth he suffer after death any Purgatory pains, if he die in that state of recovered innocency.* This I grant they own, that unless men sin after Baptism, they are neither in danger of Hell nor Purgatory ; and yet it is evident they deny that Christ has expiated the temporal punishments due to sin either in this World, or in Purgatory ; for if he had, there were

an end both of the Popish Sacrament of Penance and Purgatory: and if Christ by his death had expiated the temporal punishments of sin, I would desire to know, why the temporal punishment of sin is not as well remitted by the Sacrament of Penance, as by Baptism; since the expiation of Christ's Blood, as they pretend, is applied to us in both: and therefore this is a meer fallacy; for though a Sinner in Baptism is delivered from all punishment due to sin, yet he is not in a proper sence delivered from what they call the temporal punishment of sin, for there was no such punishment due to sin before Baptism. Hell, not Purgatory, is the punishment of all sin before Baptism, and therefore a baptized Person is delivered by Christ from Hell, which is the only punishment due to Sins before Baptism; and if he die before he commits any actual sin after Baptism, he escapes Purgatory and goes immediately to Heaven, not because Christ's death has delivered him from the temporal pains of Purgatory, but because he had done nothing to deserve it. For what they call the temporal punishment of sin is only the pains of Penance, and no man is capable of the Sacrament of Penance, who is not a baptized Christian; and yet Purgatory is of the same nature with the pains of Penance, for there men compleat the expiation of their sins by enduring the pains of Purgatory, which was wanting to perfect their Penance in this World. And therefore Baptism does not remit the temporal punishment of sin, because there is none due till men sin after Baptism: it can no more remit the temporal pains of Purgatory, than the temporal pains of Penance, which none but a baptized Sinner is obnoxious to; and therefore it is false (according to their Doctrine) to say, *That Christ obtained remission from all temporal, as well as eternal pain, unless they will say, that Christ obtained remission of the pains of Penance, and then farewell Penance and Purgatory together.* And this very bottom our Jesuite sets it on, p. 75. where he tells us, *Those who say, that it were a greater mercy in God to remit all the punishment due to sin, blame Christ for Preaching Penance, and account him on that score less merciful:* which justifies what I said, that the pains of Purgatory answer the pains of Penance, and therefore this temporal punishment of sin, was not expiated by the Death of Christ no more then Penance is: and when he can prove, that Christ Preached such Penance as this, we will acknowledge Purgatory.

But to return; I desired to know, how any man can be satisfied

fied from Scripture, that Christ by his death has delivered us from eternal punishments, if he have not delivered us from the temporal punishments of sin in the next World. For if those Texts which prove our Redemption by the Death of Christ, do not prove, that Christ has redeemed us from the whole punishment due to sin in the next World, they prove nothing, and then there is not one place of Scripture to prove, that Christ has redeemed us from eternal punishments. For if *Christ's dying for our sins, making atonement for sin, being a propitiation through faith in his blood; if remission and forgiveness of sins, being justified, having peace with God, being reconciled to God, and saved from wrath,* do not signifie taking away the punishment of sin, I desire one Text to prove, that a Sinner who is pardoned and justified shall not be eternally punished for sin: and if they do signifie taking away the punishment of sin, how can a Sinner, who is pardoned and justified be punished for his sins, so that these Scriptures either prove, that there is no Purgatory, or they cannot prove, that we shall be delivered from Hell. This Argument he slightly mentions, p. 69, but has so much wit as to say nothing to it.

I asked farther, whether there are two kinds of punishments due to sin, temporal and eternal, of such a distinct nature that the promise of forgiveness does not include both, nay that God cannot forgive both, that God can only forgive eternal punishment, but the Sinner himself must endure the temporal. If this were the case, I would grant, the promises of forgiveness could extend only to eternal punishments; but if the Curse of the Law be eternal death, and all other punishments are only parts of the Curse and a partial execution of it, then to forgive eternal punishments must include the forgiveness of temporal punishments as parts or branches of it: and this I shewed was the case here, that there is no other threatening in all the Gospel against sin, but eternal death, and therefore all other punishments are inflicted by virtue of this Law, as included in it; and consequently he who is delivered from this Curse of the Law, from eternal punishments, is delivered from the whole punishment due to sin, though not from correction and discipline, which is not properly the Curse of the Law, nor the Wrath of God. A little piece of this he cites, p. 69, but without an answer. In his following harangue indeed for Purgatory, he endeavours to prove by some examples of God's punishing those, whose sins were forgiven, and by some Sayings of the Fathers, that after the guilt of sin is forgiven, there

remains an obligation to undergo punishment; but these have been answered often enough, and are no Answer to the Argument of the *Preservative*, and therefore I am not concerned about them.

2 Cor. 4. 18.

I asked farther, why they call Purgatory, which is a place of punishment in the other World, a temporal punishment? which is an abuse of the Language of Scripture, which makes this World temporal, and the next World eternal. *The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal*: and therefore temporal punishments signify the punishments of this World, but the unseen punishments, as well as the unseen rewards, of the next World are eternal; which is a demonstration, that there is no Purgatory, unless it be eternal. This he thus repeats, p. 69. *The things which are seen (that is, of this World) are temporal; but the things, which are not seen (that is, of the next World) are eternal. This is a demonstration, that there is no Purgatory: which is both to conceal the force of the Argument, and to pervert it; for he should at least have added, there is no Purgatory, unless it be eternal.* But his answer to this is extremely pleasant, p. 76. *St. Paul never taught that all things, that are not seen, or of another World, are eternal, or else God would be eternally judging, and so never rewarding his Servants, or punishing his Enemies.* But it is plain the Apostle by things that are seen, or not seen, signifies things which are to be enjoyed or suffered by us, not any transient Acts of God or Creatures; and thus if there be any such thing as Purgatory in the other World, it must be eternal.

11 John 25,
26.

To this I added; The state of the next World is called either life or death, eternal life, or eternal death. *Those who believe in Christ shall never die.* Now I desire to know the difference between *living* and *dying* and *perishing* in the next World. For bad men do not cease to be, nor lose all sense in the next World, no more than good men; and therefore life can only signify a state of happiness, and death a state of misery. Now if good men must not *perish*, must not *die* in the next World, they must not go to Purgatory, which is as much *perishing*, as much *dying*, as Hell, though not so long. This he thus recites, p. 69. *Who believes in Christ, shall never die; therefore good men must not go to Purgatory, which is as much perishing and dying as Hell, but not so long.* Which you see, is still to conceal the force of the Argument, but the comfort is, he says nothing against it, unless his repeating it must pass for a confutation. But he immediately adds,

adds, as if it were in the same period; *otherwise Purgatory may be everlasting life for all I know, and so the pains of it eternal.* But this is several periods off. In summing up this Argument I inquired, how a Papist, who believes a Purgatory-fire, wherein he shall be tormented (God knows how long) for his sins, can prove, that a penitent sinner shall not be damned for his sins. After other proofs, which, I thought, it was reasonable for them to urge, (and I am sure they can urge no better) I alledged this in their behalf; that Christ has promised, that *those who believe in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life:* and that proves, that the pains of Purgatory cannot be for ever, for then Christ could not perform his promise of bestowing everlasting life on them: To this I answer, So I confess one would think, and so I should have thought also, that when Christ promised, that such believers should not *perish*, and should never *die*, that he meant, that such men should not go to Purgatory: but *if falling into Purgatory, he not perishing and not dying, it may everlasting life too, for ought I know, and then the pains of Purgatory may be eternal.*

I hope the Reader is by this time sensible, how easie it is to render any Discourse ridiculous by taking half Sentences, and joyning those passages together, which have no connexion and dependence.

I observed farther, That the Doctrine of Purgatory destroys our hope and confidence in the mediation of Christ; as it represents him less merciful and compassionate or less powerful than the necessities of sinners require him to be.

1. As for his Compassion. It is no great sign of tenderness and compassion to leave his Members in Purgatory-fire, which burns as hot as Hell. *Could I believe this of our Saviour, I should have very mean thoughts of his kindness, and not much rely on him for any thing----- it is a wonderful thing to me, that when a merciful man cannot see a Beast in torment without relieving it, it should be thought consistent with the mercy and compassion of our Saviour, to see us burn in Purgatory for Years and Ages.* Part of this he repeats, and I suppose thought all the World would take it for an ill saying, and therefore leaves it, as he found it; but I shall stand to it, till he confutes it.

2. If it be not want of Compassion, it must be want of Power in our Saviour to help us:----- and if he want Power to deliver from Purgatory, I should more question his Power to deliver from Hell; for that is the harder of the two: *if his Blood could not ex-*

piate.

piate for the temporal punishment of sin, which the Merits of some supererogating Saints, or the Pope's Indulgencies, or the Priests Masses can redeem us from, how could it make expiation for eternal punishment? if his interest in the Court of Heaven cannot do the less, how can it do the greater? This he calls a Misrepresentation, and truly as he has recited it, it is a very great one. P. 68. *That the Blood of Christ could not expiate for the temporal punishment of sin, which the Merits of some supererogating Saints, or the Priest's Masses, or Pope's Indulgencies can redeem us from; how then can that Blood make expiation for eternal punishment?* I say, if it cannot do one, which is the greater, much less can it do the other, which is the less; he makes me say, that it cannot do one, which is the less, and therefore cannot do the greater: This is Popish Liberty of Conscience with a witness.

From the Doctrine of Purgatory, I proceeded to the Invocation of Saints and Angels, our Mediators; whether this does not also disparage the Grace of the Gospel, the Love of God, and of our Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ, to penitent sinners.

Now I observed 1. with respect to God; That no man can believe, that God is so very gracious to sinners for the sake of Christ, who seeks to so many Advocates and Mediators to intercede for him with God. *To imagine, that we want any Mediator with God, but only our High-Priest, who mediates in virtue of his Sacrifice, is a reproach to the Divine Goodness.* This the Jesuite recites, but what he has to say to it, he does not tell us. I there shewed at large, that God does not want Entreaties to do good, though his Wisdom and Justice may require a Sacrifice and a High-Priest to make atonement for sin.

To prevent that obvious Objection, that God commands us to Pray for one another on Earth; I observed, that *this is not by way of Interest and Merit, as the Church of Rome pretends the Saints in Heaven Pray for us, but by Humble Supplications*, which I shewed was very reconcilable with the Wisdom and Goodness of God; from those excellent ends it serves in this World; this he calls a Misrepresentation, p. 68. but I pray why? do not they Pray to God in the Name and Merits of the Saints? are not all their Offices full of such Prayers? do they think the Saints in Heaven Pray only as humble Supplicants, when the very reason the Council of Trent gives, why they should fly to their Aid and Succors, is, *that they Reign with Christ?* do they not, as he adds, *take the*
Vir-

Virgin Mary, Angels and Saints for Mediators to incline God to be good to peculiar persons? which he calls another Misrepresentation; why then do they Pray so frequently and devoutly to them? why do they tell of so many miraculous Deliverances wrought by the *Virgin Mary* in favour of her Clients, and of other Saints in favour of their Devotees? *English* Protestants know these things too well, to be imposed on at this time of day by the bawling and confidence of an ignorant Jesuite.

2. I observed, That it is not less injurious to the Love of our Saviour to fly to the Prayers and Aids of Saints and the *Virgin Mary*; as if Christ either wants interest with God, or wants kindness to us, and either will not intercede for us at all, or will not do it unless he be prevailed with by the Intercession of Saints, or the Entreaties or Commands of his Mother. And having shewed what assurance we have of the Love and Compassion of our Saviour, I added, This one would have thought should have given the greatest security to sinners of his readiness to help them. *But it seems Christ is not merciful and pitiful enough: his Virgin Mother has softer and tenderer Passions, and such an interest in him, or authority over him in the right of a Mother, (as some of them have not without blasphemy represented it) that she can have any thing of him; and thus they suppose the other Saints to be much more pitiful than Christ is, and to have interest enough to protect their Supplicants, or else it is not imaginable, why they should need or desire any other Advocates.* This he calls another Misrepresentation, and makes me say, that the Church of Rome professes to believe all this; but I say no such thing, but only this is the natural interpretation of their seeking other Advocates and Mediators besides Christ: when he can give a better account of this Practice, I will acknowledge, I was mistaken in my Argument, but am no Misrepresenter; for to Argue ill, and to Misrepresent, are two things, as the Representer himself, I suppose, has learnt by this time.

SECT. III.

An Answer to the Thirty Misrepresentations and Calumnies, and some Fanatical Principles said to be offered in the Third and Fourth Sections.

HERE our Jesuite foams and rages; and I will make him rage a little more, before I have done with him. For bad Spirits are apt to rage most, the more they feel the power of Exorcism,

M

and

and then there is no way to make them quiet, but to cast them out.

The *third Section* of the *Preservative* concerned the Nature of Christian Worship, what Christ has reformed in the Worship of God, and what Worship he has prescribed.

1. As for the first, I said, that Christ has taken away every thing that was merely external in Religion; not external Acts, nor the necessary external Circumstances of Worship, but such external Rites, as either by the Institution of God, or Superstition of Men, were made Acts of Religion, to render us more acceptable to God. This I shewed was agreeable to the nature of Christian Religion, which has none of those ends to serve, for which these external Rites were instituted by God under the Jewish Law, or invented by Men. For 1. There is no Expiation or Satisfaction for Sins under the Gospel, but only the Blood of Christ, and therefore there is no place now for any Expiatory Rites and Ceremonies. 2. The Gospel makes no difference between Legal Cleanness and Uncleanness, and therefore distinctions of Meats and External Washings and Purifications are now out of date. 3. Nor is there any Symbolical Presence of God under the Gospel, which puts an end to the Legal Holiness of Places and Things. 4. Nor are Material and Inanimate Things made the Receptracles of Divine Graces and Vertues, to convey them to us merely by Contact and External Applications, like some Amulets or Charms to wear in our Pockets, or hang about our Necks. 5. The Christian Religion admits of no External or Ceremonial Righteousness— Now this cuts off every thing, which is External in Religion at a blow, because it cuts off all hopes and relyances on an External Righteousness. 6. Hence it appears, that the Christian Religion can admit nothing, that is External, but only some Federal Rites; such as the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are— And such Rites as these are necessary in all instituted Religions, which depend upon free and voluntary Covenants. *For since Mankind has by sin forfeited their natural right to God's favour, they can challenge nothing from him now, but by Promise and Covenant, and since such Covenants require a mutual stipulation on both sides, they must be transacted by some visible and sensible Rites, whereby God obliges himself to us and we to him.* This he calls a Fanatical Principle, but why I know not. And says, *that this is destroyed by my former Principle of taking away all Rites that are Acts of Religion.* This is a severe Man, who will not allow.

allow me to make one Exoeption from a General Rule, which no man yet was ever denied ; especially when I give such a peculiar reason for the Exception, as is applicable to nothing else : that an instituted Religion is and must be founded on a Covenant, that a Covenant must be transacted by visible and sensible Rites ; for there cannot be a visible Covenant, nor a visible Church founded on this Covenant without visible and sensible Rites. And this I suppose he will think a sufficient Answer to what he says. That *on this Principle I ought to teach, that the mutual stipulation betwixt God and us must be made by his interior Graces, and our interior Worship, because God must be worshipped as a meer Spirit.* That God must be worshipped as a meer Spirit, and therefore without any external Acts of Worship I never said, much less did I assign it as my reason here against a meer external Worship, that God must be worshipped as a meer Spirit, but that the nature of the Christian Religion will not admit of such an external Worship. And yet if he can tell me, how this Stipulation or Covenant can be made betwixt God and us by interior Graces without some visible covenanting Rite, how the Christian Church, which is a visible Society distinguished from the rest of the World by a visible Covenant, can be thus visibly incorporated by interior invisible Graces, I will confels then, that there had been no need, had Christ so pleased, of any visible Sacraments.

*Preserv. Con-
sid. p. 85.*

He adds, *upon whatever account that interior Covenant* (but we speak of an external visible Covenant, which requires visible Pledges and Seals) *requires a visible sensible Mark, and our actual Communion with Christ another, all the Communications of God's Graces to us, all our return of Worship and Adoration will equally admit of sensible Signs and Rites.* Let us apply this then to those Instances I gave of this external Worship, and see whether there be the same reason for that, as there is for some visible signs of a visible Covenant. The same reason and necessity, for instance, of some external Rites to expiate sin ; now the Gospel declares, there is no expiation of sin, but the Blood of Christ, that there is of Gospel-Sacraments to apply the expiation of Christ's Death to us. The same necessity of external Washings and Purifications, distinction of Meats, &c. Now the Gospel has put an end to all legal Uncleanness, as there is of Baptism to wash away our Sins, or of the Lord's Supper

to strengthen and refresh our Souls by a Spiritual feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ: the same external holiness of Places to sanctifie our Worship, now God has declared, that he has no symbolical Presence on Earth, the same necessity of material and inanimate receptacles and conveyances of Divine Graces and Vertues, the same necessity of an external and ceremonial Righteousness, which is such a contradiction to the whole design of the Gospel, as there is of the Gospel-Sacraments to receive us into Covenant, and to convey the Blessings of the Covenant to us. As for external Acts and Circumstances of Worship and Adoration, I allowed the necessity of them under the Gospel, but these are very different things from external religious Rites, and if he knows no reason, why the conveyances of Grace should rather be confined to the two Gospel-Sacraments, then to Holy Water, or *Agnus Dei's*, or the Reliques of Saints, or such other Popish Inventions, I will tell him one: because the Spirit of Grace is the Spirit of Christ and derives his influences only to the mystical body of Christ, all our Graces are the immediate influxes of the Divine Spirit, and nothing can intitle us to the Graces of the Spirit, but being Members of Christ's Body, and there are no visible Sacraments of Union to Christ, but Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and therefore no visible Rites of conveying the Graces of the Divine Spirit to us but these. Again, As our Spiritual Life consists in our Union to Christ, so this Union makes us New Creatures, for *he that is in Christ is a New Creature*: Now there are but two things necessary to a New Creature, a new birth, and a constant supply of nourishment for its increase and growth. Baptism is our Regeneration or New Birth, whereby we are incorporated into Christ's Mystical Body, and receive the first Communications of a Divine Life from the Holy Spirit; the Lord's Supper is the constant Food and Nourishment of our Souls, wherein we receive fresh supplies of Grace, as our Natural Bodies do new Spirits from the Meat we eat. Now let any man tell me, what more is necessary to a New Creature, than to be born and to be nourished by fresh supplies of Grace, till it grow up to a perfect man in Christ Jesus: all this is done for us by Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and if all Divine Grace must be derived to us from our Union to Christ as the Members of his Body,

Body, nothing can be more congruous than that the Sacraments of our Union to Christ, should be the only visible and external Rites of conveying all supernatural Grace to us : so that unless Holy Water and Relicks, &c. be new Sacraments of our Union to Christ, they can be no Gospel conveyances of Grace ; and by the way, whoever well considers this, will think it little less than a demonstration, that there can be but two Gospel Sacraments, because there are no other visible Rites of uniting us to Christ, and consequently of conveying supernatural Grace to us, which is the Notion of a Sacrament. But to proceed,

I came to apply this Discourse to Popish Worship to see, how consistent it is with that Reformation Christ had made of the Worship of God under the Gospel. And I observed in general, that whoever only considers the vast number of Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of *Rome*, must conclude it as Ritual and Ceremonial a Religion as Judaism itself: the Ceremonies are as many, more obscure, unintelligible and useless, *more severe and intolerable than the Jewish Yoke itself, which St. Peter tells the Jews neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear.* The first part he has nothing to say to, and by his silence confesses, it to be true, and that is proof enough, that it is no Christian Worship. But he will by no means allow, that they are as severe and as intolerable as the Jewish Yoke : this he calls a *P. 80.* Misrepresentation, and looks about to see, what it should be, that is so intolerable ; he suspects I mean their Fasts in Lent, or on *Fridays* and *Saturdays*, but he is much mistaken ; I know all these are very easie and gentle things in the Church of *Rome* ; or that *Prayer and Almsdeeds* may be these terrible things. And here he comes pretty near the matter, for I look upon it very intolerable to say over so many Prayers and Masses every day without understanding one word they say, which is the daily Task of many thousand Priests, who understand no more what they say, than the People do. To part with their real Estates, many times to the great damage of their Families, out of a blind Devotion to deliver their Souls from the imaginary Flames of Purgatory, which they call Almsdeeds: to whip and macerate their Bodies (if they be so blindly devout) with severe Fasts (for men may fast severely in the Church of *Rome* if they please) with long Watchings, hard Lodging, tedious and

and expensive Pilgrimages, not to cure, but to expiate their sins. He says, *If the Ceremonies used in the Liturgy*, he should have said in their Mass-Book and Rituals, and Breviaries, *be a burden, surely the Clergy or Religions must feel the weight of it, yet I am sure not one ever owned it.* Is he sure of this? Has he confessed all the Nuns and Monks? but if they have not owned it, Have they never felt it neither? Will he himself say this? but suppose they neither felt nor owned it, May it not be as intolerable as the Jewish Law? Did the Scribes and Pharisees, who were so fond of the Rites of *Moses*, own it to be a heavy Yoke? And yet does not St. *Peter* say it was so? Superstition will bear very heavy yokes of external Rites and Ceremonies without complaining, to be delivered from what they think a more terrible yoke of mortifying and subduing sin, but yet they are very unsupportable Yokes still to ingenuous and vertuous Minds.

Hence I proceeded to a more particular consideration of their Worship. 1. That most of their external Rites are professedly intended as expiations and satisfactions for sin. This he durst not deny, and therefore all their expiatory Rites are no part of Christian Worship, which allows no expiation for sin, but the Blood of Christ.

Secondly, Those distinctions between Meats, which the Church of *Rome* calls fasting (for a Canonical Fast is not to abstain from Food, but from such Meats as are forbid on fasting days) can be no part of Christian Worship, because the Gospel allows of no distinction between clean and unclean things, and therefore of no distinction of Meats neither; *For meat commendeth us not to God*, 1 Cor. 8. 8.

Here is another Mis-representation; That a *Canonical Fast is not to abstain from Food.* Does he deny this? Yes he says, *this is most false, but one Meal being allowed of on Fasting days.* A terrible Penance this! which most of our Merchants, and Citizens endure all the year round, and eat later too generally than they do on fasting days: But is there no Repast of Wine and Sweetmeats to be had at night for those who can purchase them?

I added, There is no imaginable reason, why it should be an Act of Religion, meerly to abstain from Flesh, if Flesh have no legal uncleanness; and if it had, we must all have been

Carthusians, and never eat Flesh more: for how it should be clean one day, and unclean another, is not easie to understand. This is another of his Mis-representations; for that is the word, right or wrong. He says, *I would insinuate that they Judaize.* Whereas I expressly said, that they did not Judaize, but did something more *absurd*: for they do not make such a distinction between clean and unclean Beasts, as the Law of *Moses* did, and therefore are the more absurd, in forbidding to eat Flesh, or any thing that comes of Flesh. But, he says, when God by *Jeremy* praises the *Rechabites* for abstaining from Wine, was it because Wine was held by them to have a legal uncleanness? No, nor is Wine Flesh. But, Is taming of the flesh, the curbing of sensuality, no reason at all for abstinence? And does abstinence consist merely in abstaining from Flesh? Will not good Fish and good Wine pamper the Flesh too? To place abstinence in *delectu ciborum*, as in abstaining from Flesh, is a senseless piece of Superstition: if it serve the ends of Mortification, it is well; if it be made essential to a Religious Fast, it's absurd, and no part of Christian Worship.

Thus I shewed, 3ly, that the Church of Rome has infinitely out-done the Jewish Law, in the Religion of holy Places, Altars, Vestments, Utensils, &c. which he passes over silently. 4ly. That they attribute divine Vertues and Powers to senseless and inanimate things, as is evident from that great Veneration they pay to Relicks, and those great Vertues they ascribe to them: from their consecrations of their *Agnus Dei's*, their *Wax-Candles*, *Oyl*, *Bells*, *Crosses*, *Images*, *Ashes*, *Holy Water*, for the health of Soul and Body, to drive away evil Spirits, to allay Storms, to heal Diseases, to pardon Venial and sometimes mortal Sins, merely by kissing or touching them, carrying them in their hands, wearing them about their necks, &c. — These things look more like Charms than Christian Worship. — Indeed they argue, that such men do not understand what Grace and Sanctification means, who think that little Images of Wax, that Candles, that Oyl, that Water and Salt, that Bells, that Crosses, can be sanctified by the Spirit of God, and convey Grace and Sanctification, by the sight, or sound, or touch, or such external applications. — He who thinks that inanimate things are capable of the Sanctification of the Spirit, or can convey this Sanctification: to us by some divine and invisible effluvia of Grace; may

Pag. 19.

may as well lodge Reason, and Understanding, and Will, and Passions, in senseless matter, and receive it from them again by a kiss or touch. Here are three of his thirty Misrepresentations all together; and yet the Jesuit is more tame, than the Devil is usually represented to be, when he is frightened with Holy Water. But let us hear him: *All these are Misrepresentations of our Faith, which teaches us nothing of all this.* Well, however this is pretty moderate; here is no Hectoring yet; no *Minister Oates*, and *Minister Sherlock*. *What we believe, is, that nothing can free us from the guilt of any sin, which is external, and doth not affect and change the heart.* But this is not the Question, Sir, but whether *Agnus Dei's*, Holy Water, &c. can deliver from the guilt of sin, and drive away the Devil, and work a great many Deliverances for us; whether with or without the change of heart: if they can affect and change the heart, that is the better way; and then they effectually convey Grace, which is the thing I said, and which he dares not deny: if they cannot forgive sin, I desire him to tell his People so, who like that better than changing the heart; and then they will purchase no more *Agnus Dei's*, nor trade in such Roman Merchandize. But they believe, *That all Creatures of God are good, and that they are sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer.* What! to forgive Sins, to give Grace, to allay Storms, to drive away Devils? Was this the Apostle's meaning in those words? Is there any word of Promise in the Gospel for this? Which is the meaning of being sanctified by the word. *Neither doth Faith teach us, that any material thing hath any other than moral connexion with Grace, either obtained for us by the Prayers of the Church, offered for us at the blessing of those things, or of those blessed Saints whom we honour, and call upon by that Veneration, or by the Sacraments, according to the Institution and Covenant of Christ; but we do not believe, that God's Grace is inherent, but in the Souls of the Faithful, or that any sin is remitted, without a due disposition in a repentant sinner.* As for the Sacraments, I have already given an account of their Vertue and Efficacy, that they are instituted signs and means of our Union to Christ, and that intitles us to the influences of the divine Grace: Whether it be a natural or moral connexion between Grace and such inanimate things, is not the Question, but it seems Grace is annexed to them;

them; which is all I affirm: But however Grace is annexed to them, the conveyance of Grace from them to the Soul, by meer external applications, as by lighting up, or carrying a consecrated Taper, by sprinkling Athes on our heads, by sprinkling our selves with Holy Water, by wearing an *Agnus Dei*, or some Relicks about us, &c. look as if it was done, not by a moral but a natural efficacy; for what moral efficacy can such things have upon our minds? But let it be done how it will, it seems such divine Vertues and Powers are naturally or morally annexed to inanimate and senseless things, and naturally or morally conveyed from them to the Soul, by external applications, and I desire him to shew me the difference between such Observances and Pagan Charms. He has confessed enough, and as much as we could desire of him, when he adds, *Or any Vertue to be now-a-days communicated otherwise by insensible things, than it was to the woman that touched the hem of Christ's Garments,* (for Christ felt Vertue to pass from him, and therefore it was a very real Communication) or by the handkerchiefs of St. Paul, or shadow of St. Peter: And here were real and sensible effects, without any moral, but only natural or rather supernatural efficacy upon the Patient. And if Holy Water, and *Agnus Dei's* convey Grace at this rate, I assure you, they are very notable things. His undertaking at last to prove, *Whenever required, that they use no other blessings* (or Consecrations of such inanimate things to such spiritual purposes) *but what they find in the Records of the Primitive Church to have been ordered by the Apostles,* is bold and brave, and I here challenge him to make it good; but I hope he will produce better Records for it, than his Homily of St. *Austin* of the Assumption of the blessed Virgin.

gly. I observed farther, that all this encouraged men to trust in an external Righteousness. For, 1. Such external Rites are very apt to degenerate into Superstition. Especially, 2. When they are recommended as very acceptable to God, as satisfactions for our sins, and meritorious of great Rewards. And this is that use they serve in the Church of Rome: *They assert the necessity of humane satisfactions; and what are these satisfactory works? Fastings, Whippings, Pilgrimages, &c. all which men may do, without the least sorrow for sin, without any true Devotion to God, without mortifying any one Lust.* To make this a

Mis-representation, he repeats it thus : *They account satisfactory works, Fastings, Acts of Penance, Prayers, Alms, though done without the least sorrow for sin, &c.* Whereas I say, they account these satisfactory works, and they may be done without the least sorrow for sin. Now are not these satisfactory works ? That he dares not deny. May not all these be done, without sorrow for sin ? That he dares not deny neither. And this is all I said ; but then he will not allow, that they are satisfactory works, without sorrow for sin : I would to God he could persuade all the Members of his Church of the truth of this. But let me ask him one Question : Are these Acts of Penance in the Church of *Rome* intended as expressions of sorrow for sin, or as satisfactions for the punishment due to it ? Are they necessary, before Absolution, to qualify men to receive the pardon of their sins, as the signs and demonstrations of a sincere repentance ? or to be performed after the sin is forgiven, not to express our sorrow for sin, but to undergo the punishment of it ? Are they always the voluntary choice of the sinner, as the expressions of a hearty sorrow are, or the sentence of a Judge, imposed by the Priest upon Absolution, or by the fears of Purgatory ? Now if such Acts of Penance are only intended to satisfy for the punishment, I think to undergo punishment, whether with or without sorrow for sin, does satisfy for the punishment of sin : Sorrow may be necessary to Absolution ; but when the guilt of sin is pardoned, if men can undergo their penance without sorrow, the satisfaction is never the less : and should he promote this Doctrine, that the works of Penance avail nothing, unless they be done with a hearty sorrow for sin, men would not be so easily persuaded to undergo their Penances, especially if the Priest be severe.

I observed farther, that the true reason why any thinking men are so fond of an external Righteousness, is to excuse them from true and real Holiness of Life——All men know, that in the Offices of Piety and Vertue they can never do more than is their duty ; and therefore as nothing can be matter of merit, which is our duty, *So the true intention of all merits and works of Supererogation, are to supply the place of Duty, and to satisfy for their sins, or to purchase a Reward, which they have no title to by doing their duty : that is, because they do not*
their

their duty. But then the Jesuit represents it, as if I said, *They* Pag. 81.
could have no reward for doing their duty, and therefore they add
works of Supererogation; which is Jesuit like: they may be re-
warded for their duty, if they would do it, though they can-
not merit by doing their duty.

3ly. I observed, that to make these meritorious and satisfactory Superstitions more easie, one man may satisfy for another, and communicate his Merits to him: this the Jesuit confidently says, *is a sham; for each man is bound to satisfy for himself, fulfilling the Penances imposed on him.* Now suppose that men are bound personally to perform those Penances which are imposed on them by their Priests in Confession, what I said was not confined to Penances imposed in Confession; and I presume he will grant there are other satisfactions and penances necessary besides these. Did he never hear of men, who have been hired to whip themselves for some rich and great sinners? to say such a number of *Ave-Maries* for them? If one man cannot satisfy for another, what becomes of their Indulgences, which are the application of the Merits of Supererogating Saints to those who need them?

Another Misrepresentation is, that I say, *They pay for Indul-* Pag. 79.
gences with Money, and buy Satisfaction and Merits. But though Indulgences are not to be had without Money, it is a sad Misrepresentation to call this *Buying*, which should only be called *Alms-deeds*: but the thing is the same, let them call it what they will; Alms-deeds, if they will call them Alms-deeds, and that at a set rate and down-right Bargain, are the price of Indulgences and Satisfaction; and if this were the reason of giving Alms, were there such an express Bargain and Sale in the case, I am of his mind, that every *Alms-giver might with as much justice be accused to have bought of God his Grace and Pardon for a sum of money.*

From hence I proceeded to shew, what kind of Worship Christ has prescribed to his Disciples, and the general account we have of it. 4 John 23, 24. *But the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him: God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.* In which description of Gospel-Worship, there are three things included. 1. That we must worship God under the notion

A Vindication of the Second Part of

of a pure and infinite Spirit: 2. under the character of a Father. 3. With the Mind and Spirit. But he has found little here to except against, only two or three Fanatical Principles, which shall be briefly considered.

Pag. 85.

The first. *God being a Spirit, must not be sought for in Houses of Wood and Stone: because he must be worshipped in Spirit* (as a Spirit it should be, which differ greatly) *he must not be worshipped by any material or sensible Representations* (by material Images and Pictures) *those words except your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, cuts off every thing, that is external in Religion.* Here he has jumbled things together of a different nature. I shall begin with the last first, because it concerns what I have already accounted for. That the Christian Religion admits of no external nor ceremonial Righteousness: the great design of the Gospel being to make us truly good, that we may be partakers of the Divine Nature. There is nothing our Lord does more severely condemn than an external and Pharisaical Righteousness— *Except your Righteousness exceed the Righteousness, &c.* Now this (not these words merely, but this rejecting an external Righteousness) cuts off every thing that is external in Religion at a blow, because it cuts off all hopes and reliances on an external Righteousness, and I believe men will not be fond of such Superstitions, when they know, they will do them no good. Now what is the fault of this? *do not these Principles remit all Christians to the silent Meetings of Quakers? exclude singing of Psalms?* that is, because it excludes an external Righteousness, it excludes all external Acts of Worship. Well rhymed Father, Brains and Stairs.

Since God will be worshipped as a Spirit, he will now confine his peculiar Presence to no place, as he formerly did to the Temple at *Jerusalem*,— for though for typical reasons he had a typical and symbolical presence under the *Jewish* dispensation, yet this was not so agreeable to his nature, who is a Spirit, and will now be worshipped as a Spirit, and therefore *must not now be sought for in Houses of Wood and Stone*: This, says he, *excludes the use of Churches rather than Barns.* That is, because God does not confine his presence to one place, because he has no symbolical presence, therefore there must be no places set apart from common uses for Religious Worship.

Thus.

Thus God will be worshipped as a Spirit, and therefore not by Images, or material Representations, which are so unlike a Spirit; that is, says he not by such material Representations as singing of Psalms. Well guess't for a Jesuite!

The second Fanatical Principle is this. *God and Christ are* ^{ibid.} *not present in the Assemblies of Christians by a figurative and symbolical Presence: There is no symbolical Presence of God under the Gospel. Though God fills all Places, it is a great absurdity to talk of more symbolical Presences than one: for a symbolical Presence confines the unlimited Presence of God to a certain place, in order to certain ends, as to receive the Worship, that is paid to him, and to answer the Prayers, that are made to him; now to have more than one such Presence as this, is like having more Gods than one. To which he answers, to say nothing of the absurdity of this Discourse, which makes that Christian an Adorer of two Gods, who by Faith adoring God in Heaven and in his own Soul, worships him in both places. Truly he had better have said nothing, than nothing to the purpose; for is God symbolically present in Heaven, or in the Souls of Men? in Heaven he is really present, in the Souls of Men he is present by his Grace and Spirit, but in neither by Symbols and Figures of his Presence, as he was present in the Temple. But he has a terrible Argument to come. Doth not this destroy the very essence of your Sacrament, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, which you own to be a symbolical Presence of Christ? but no Place nor Object of Worship. And yet though we grant the Eucharist is a Symbol and Figure of Christ's Body and Blood, it is no Symbol of Christ's bodily and personal Presence, unless it be a Symbol of Christ's bodily Presence on the Cross, for it is a Symbol only of Christ's broken Body and of his Blood shed for us; and the intention of it is not to represent Christ bodily present with us, but to be a Memorial of him in his bodily absence, and therefore it is no symbolical Presence of Christ; for the Figures and Symbols of his Body and Blood, if they be a symbolical Presence, must be the Symbols of his bodily Presence.*

His third Fanatical Principle is this. *If God be better worshipped before an Image than without one, then the Worship of God is more confined to that place, where the Image is. I cannot see, how to avoid this, whereas there is no appropriate place of Worship under*
the

A Vindication of the Second Part of

the Gospel: and 'tis the same case, tho' the Image be not appropriated to any place, but carried about with us; for still the Image makes the Place of Worship. Most of these are my words, but he has transplaced them so, as to lose the Argument. The force of the Argument is this. If the Worship of God must not be confined to any Place or symbolical Presence, then he must not be worshipped by an Image, for an Image is a representative Presence of God, or of the Saints, and Men go to Images as to Divine Presences to Worship; so that where-ever the Image is, which is a symbolical Presence, whether fixt in a Church, or carried from one place to another, it makes it a peculiar place of Worship, as having a symbolical Presence. So that the whole force of the Argument, lies upon an Image being a symbolical Presence. And this he tells us is an Argument for all Dissenters against a Liturgy, or Set-Form of Prayer, (I suppose he means the Book of the Liturgy, or Forms of Prayer) for if God be better worshipped by a Set-Form of Prayer, than without it, then the Worship of God is more confined to that place, where that Set-Form of Prayer, that Set-Liturgy is used; and 'tis the same tho' no set place be appointed for that Set-Form of Prayer. The Parallel is exact. It is so indeed, if he can prove the Common-Prayer-Book to be a symbolical Presence of God, as an Image is, but till then it is ridiculous.

At the conclusion of this Section I observed, that to worship God in Spirit, is to worship him with our Mind and Spirit. And from hence I shewed the absurdity of Praying to God in an Unknown Tongue, when neither our Understandings, nor Affections can joyn in our Prayers. For I suppose no man will say, that to pray to God or praise him in words which we do not understand, is to worship God in Spirit, unless he thinks, that a Parrot may be taught to pray in the Spirit. This he calls a Calumny. He would insinuate, that Catholicks when they assist to (present he should have said at) Prayers, which they do not understand, are not commanded to pray in Spirit by devout Thoughts and pious Affections. Now I insinuate no such thing: when they are present at Prayers which they do not understand, they may have other devout thoughts for ought I know, but I say they cannot offer those Prayers to God with their understanding, which they do not understand, and in such Prayers they do not pray with the Mind and Spirit, and therefore all such

such Prayers are absurd, and contrary to the nature of Christian Worship, which is to worship God in Spirit.

But my work is not at an end yet; there are some other Misrepresentations and Calumnies, which he has picked out of the fourth *Section* of the *Preservative*, which must be considered.

The fourth *Section* concerns the reformation and improvement of Humane Nature, which I shewed to be the great design of the Gospel, and that particularly with respect to Knowledge and Holiness; and I examined how far the Principles and Practices of the Church of *Rome* did comply with this great Gospel Design.

1. As for Knowledge, I supposed, neither the Church of *Rome* nor any one for her would pretend that she is any great Friend to Knowledge, which is so apt to make men Hereticks. That knowing Papists are not beholden to their Church for their Knowledge, which deprives them of all the means of Knowledge; will not allow them to believe their senses, but commands them to believe Transubstantiation, which is contrary to the evidence of sense; forbids men the use of Reason in matters of Religion; suffers them not to judge for themselves, nor examine the Reasons of their Faith; and denies them the use of the Bible, which is the only means to know the revealed Will of God: and when men must neither believe their Senses, nor use their Reason, nor read the Scripture, it is easie to guess, what knowing and understanding Christians they must needs be.

Against this it may be objected, that the Church of *Rome* does instruct her Children in the true Christian Faith, though she will not allow them to read the Scriptures nor judge for themselves, which is the safer way to teach them the pure Catholick Faith without danger of Error or Heresie. To this I answered, This were something, did the Church of *Rome* take care to instruct them in all necessary Doctrines, and to teach nothing but what is true; and could such men, who thus tamely receive the dictates of the Church, be said to know and to understand their Religion: so that here were two Inquiries, 1. Whether the Church of *Rome* instructs her Children in all necessary truth, and nothing but the truth. 2. Whether she so instructs them, that they may be said to know

P. 87.

know and understand. How far the Church of *Rome* is from doing the first, I said, all Christians in the World are sensible but themselves, but that is not our present Dispute. But our Jesuite it seems will make it the Dispute, or it shall pass for a perfect Slander, for thus he repeats it, *they take no care to instruct men in all necessary Doctrines.* Which I did not positively affirm, but since he will have it so, I do now affirm, That *they do not instruct men in all necessary Doctrines, and that they teach them a great many false Doctrines.* But then he must remember, what I mean by *instructing*, it is not meerly to teach them to repeat the Articles of their Creed, but to give them the true sense and meaning of them; and I do affirm, and am ready to prove it, and possibly may do so, when leisure permits, that they do not rightly instruct men in the great and necessary Doctrine of forgiveness of Sins in the Name of Christ, nor in the nature of Christ's Mediation and Intercession for us, nor in the nature of Justification, or of Gospel and Obedience, but teach such Errors as overthrow the true Gospel notion of these great and necessary Doctrines.

Then as for their manner of Teaching, to require men to believe what they say meerly upon the Authority of the Church, without suffering them to examine, whether such Doctrines are taught in Scripture, or to exercise their own reason and judgment about it, can make no man a knowing and understanding Christian. For no man understands his Religion, who does not in some measure know the reasons of his Faith, and judge whether they be sufficient or not; who knows not how to distinguish between Truth and Error, who has no Rule to go by, but must take all upon trust, and the credit of his Teachers, who believes whatever he is told, and *learns his Creed as School-boys do their Grammar, without understanding it*: this is not an active, but a kind of passive knowledge: *Such men receive the impression that is made on them, as Wax does, and understand no more of the matter.* These Sayings that are marked out, are more of his Misrepresentations, which need no other Vindication, but to be shewn in their own light, and proper places.

And yet I did not deny, but some men might be so dull and stupid, as to be capable of little more than to be taught their Religion as Children, but certainly this is not the utmost

most perfection of knowledge, that any Christian must aim at : which he thus represents, *With them this is the utmost perfection of Knowledge, that any Christian must aim at.* This I did not say, but this I say, that it is the utmost perfection of Knowledge, which any man can attain to, who will be contented with the Methods of the Church of *Rome*, not to examine his Religion, but to take all upon the credit of the Church.

Well, How does our Jesuite confute this *heavy Charge and perfect Slander* ? Does he shew, that they teach all necessary Truths, and nothing but Truth ? Does he prove that men may be very knowing Christians without understanding the Reasons of their Faith ? Not one word of this, which alone was to his purpose ; but he says, hundreds of thousands of Religious men are employed in instructing the Ignorant, and teaching Children ; and whoever denied this, that they do teach Men and Children after their fashion ? But does this prove, that they teach them all necessary Truths, and nothing but truth ? Or that they make them ever the wiser for their teaching ? As for those ignorant Protestants he has had to deal with, if he made Converts of them, I believe they were very ignorant ; otherwise if there were Ignorance between them, it was as likely to lie on the Jesuite's side.

Having laid down this as a Principle, that one great design of the Gospel is to improve the Knowledge of Mankind, I hence inferred, 1. That to forbid People to read and meditate on the Word of God, can be no Gospel Doctrine, unless not to read the Bible be a better way to improve Knowledge than to read it. 2. This is a mighty presumption also against Transubstantiation, that it is no Gospel Doctrine, because it overthrows the very fundamental principles of Knowledge, as I shewed at large, and wonder he has not one word to say for Transubstantiation. 3. The Authority of an Infallible Judge, whom we must believe in every thing, without examining the reasons of what he affirms, nay though he teaches such Doctrines as appear to us most expressly contrary to Sense and Reason and Scripture, is no Gospel-Doctrine, because it is not the way to make men wise and understanding Christians, for to suspend the exercise of Reason and Judgment, is not the way to improve Mens Knowledge ; and here I distinguish between an infallible Teacher and an infallible Judge. The

first teaches infallibly, but yet he that learns, must use his own Reason and Judgment, unless a man can learn without it. But the Second usurps the Office of every Man's private Reason and Judgment, and will needs judge for all Mankind, as if he were an universal Soul, an universal Reason and Understanding, which is to unsoul all Mankind in matters of Religion. And therefore though there have been infallible Teachers, as *Moses* and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, yet none ever pretended to be infallible Judges but the Church of Rome.—*Though there may be an infallible Teacher, there never can be an infallible Judge, to whom I must submit my own Reason and Judgment without examination, because I cannot know, that he teaches infallibly, unless I am sure, that he teaches nothing, that is contrary to any natural or revealed Law, and that I cannot know, unless I may judge of his Doctrine by the light of Nature and Revelation: for he is not infallible, if he contradicts any natural or revealed Laws. I gave an instance of this in Moses and the Prophets, and in Christ himself: for when Christ appeared, there was a written Law, and all the Miracles he wrought could not have proved him a true Prophet, had he contradicted the Scriptures of the old Testament. And therefore he appeals to Moses and the Prophets to bear testimony to his Person and Doctrine: and then Miracles gave Authority to any New Revelation he made of God's Will, when it appeared, that he had not contradicted the Old. The Law of Nature and the Law of Moses were the Laws of God, and God cannot contradict himself; and therefore the Doctrine of all new Prophets, even of Christ himself was to be examined, and is to be examined to this day by the Law and the Prophets; and therefore though he was certainly an infallible Teacher, yet men were to judge of his Doctrine, before they believed; and he did not require them to lay aside their Reason and Judgement, and submit to his infallible Authority without examination.*

This our Jesuite makes a horrible outcry about, which has made me transcribe the whole of this Argument. He will hardly allow either the Author, or the Licenser to be Christians, and reserved this for the concluding Blow to end his Pamphlet with: *What Jesus our God blessed for evermore, even when owned the Son of God, even from us Christians, cannot exact a submission to his infallible Authority, without examining*

examining the truth of what he says, by comparing it with the principles of humane reason : this is the sum of all his Answer, the rest is raving and senseless harangue. But the fallacy of all this lies in a few words, Jesus the Son of God blessed for evermore, even when owned the Son of Son, even by us Christians. For those who own him the Son of God, no doubt will submit to his infallible Authority, and therefore all profess Christians must do so ; but that which I said is this, that no man could, nor to this day can own him, upon wise consideration, to be a true Prophet, and the Son of God, till he is satisfied, that he neither contradicts the plain light of Nature nor the Law of Moses ; and therefore thus far we are to examine his Doctrine ; but when it is evident he contradicts no former Revelations, and confirms his Authority by Miracles, then we are to believe any new Revelations he makes upon his own Authority. And therefore in my own Name, and the Name of the Licensor, I here profess, that when by examining the Doctrine of Christ by the Light of Nature and the Law of Moses, I find he has contradicted neither, and by the great Miracles he wrought, I am satisfied he is an Infallible Teacher, then I own him for such an Infallible Teacher (or Judge if he pleases) that I must not judge of his Doctrine (excepting the case of the Light of Nature and the Law of Moses) but believe it, and submit to him ; and in these cases, I submit to his Infallible Authority without examination ; I receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles.

I do not wonder the Jesuite is so much disturbed at this, for if it appears, that Christ himself did not pretend to be such an Infallible Judge, as he would have us believe the Pope or Church of Rome to be, they must for shame give up this kind of Infallibility : and therefore if he has a mind to Confute this Principle thoroughly, that he may understand my mind plainly, I will reduce all to some few Propositions, which he may try his skill upon, when he pleases.

1. That no Prophet is to be believed in contradiction to such plain and evident Principles of Nature, as all Mankind agree in.

2. That the first Prophet, who appears in the World, before any revealed Law, and confirms his Authority by plain and evident Miracles, is to be believed in every thing he says,

A Vindication of the Second Part of

while he does not contradict the plain and evident principles of natural Knowledge. And for that reason *Moses* was to be believed in every thing, which did not contradict the light of Nature, because he was the first Prophet, who made a Publick Revelation of God's Will to the World.

3. That succeeding Prophets, who confirm their Authority with Miracles, are to be believed in all new Revelations they make, which neither contradict the Light of Nature, nor any former Revelations; and therefore Christ is absolutely to be believed, when it appears, that he neither contradicted the Light of Nature, nor the Law of *Moses*.

4. When the Revelation is compleat and perfect, and has no new additions to be made to it, (as the Gospel-Revelation is) how infallible soever any Teachers may be, we must believe them in nothing, which either contradicts the light of Nature, or the standing Revelation, or is not contained in the Revelation.

And this shews us, how far we are to submit our own Reason and Judgment to an infallible Teacher; that is, when we are convinced of his infallibility, we must then believe him upon his own word, but not till then. And therefore we must of necessity judge of all Prophets, till we can prove them true Prophets, and then we must believe them without judging. The Miracles *Moses* wrought were a sufficient reason to believe him to be a true Prophet, while he did not contradict the Laws of Nature, and thus far all men were to judge of him, and not to rely upon his Authority; but when by his Miracles and the agreement of his Doctrine with natural Principles, they were satisfied, he was a true Prophet, they were to judge no farther, but to receive every thing else upon his Authority.

When Christ appeared in the World, men were to judge of him, before they believed, and that not only by Miracles, and the Conformity of his Doctrine to the Light of Nature, but by his Agreement with the Law of *Moses*, which was a standing Revelation: and when by these Marks he was known to be the true *Messias*, they were to believe every thing else he said upon his own Authority.

But Christ having now given us a perfect Revelation of God's Will, to which no additions must be made; we are to believe

believe no men, how infallible soever, any further than they agree with the Gospel-Revelation, and therefore must judge for our selves both of the sense of Scripture, and the Doctrine they teach; which is a plain demonstration, that as there never was such an infallible Teacher, whom we must in all cases believe without examination, (which is what the Church of *Rome* means by an infallible Judge) for *Moses* his Doctrine was to be examined by the Light of Nature, and Christ's by the Light of Nature and the Law of *Moses*; so now especially can there be no such infallible Judge, because the Gospel is the entire and perfect Rule of Faith, and we must believe no man, against or beyond the Gospel-Revelation; and therefore must judge for our selves, and compare his Doctrine with the Rule; which confounds the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*. This is the Scheme of my Principles; and now he knows, what he has to answer, when he has a mind to it.

4ly. I observed farther, To pretend the Scripture to be an obscure or imperfect Rule, is a direct contradiction to the design of the Gospel, to improve and perfect Knowledge. He says nothing about the Obscurity of the Rule, as for the Imperfections of it, I observed, they pretended to supply the Defects of Scripture by Unwritten Traditions. The first Answer I gave to this, which alone he pretends to say something to, was this. If the Scriptures be an imperfect Rule, then all Christians have not a perfect Rule, because they have not the keeping of unwritten Traditions, and know not what they are, till the Church is pleased to tell them; and it seems it was a very great while before the Church thought fit to do it: for suppose all the new Articles of the Council of Trent, were unwritten Traditions, fifteen hundred Years was somewhat of the longest to have so considerable a part of the Rule of Faith concealed from the World. Which the Jesuits thus repeats; *The Catholicks by unwritten Traditions, that* Pag. 77.
make up a part of their Rule of Faith, mean such things as may be concealed from the World for 1500 Years, never heard of before in the Church of God, kept very privately and secretly for several Ages, and totally unwritten. Whereas I said nothing at all of this, but that if the Twelve new Articles of Pope *Pius* his Creed in the Council of Trent, be pretended (as they do pretend) to be the Tradition of the Church, then *de facto* this Tradition was concealed for near 1500 Years, for there was no such Tradition known

known before, nor at the time of the Council of *Trent*, as has been proved as to several Articles, by the learned Dean of *St. Pauls*; and, when our Jesuite pleases, he may try to confute him.

54. I observed, that an implicit Faith, or believing as the Church believes, without knowing what it is we believe, can be no Gospel Doctrine, because it is not for the improvement of Knowledge. And here I observed, that some Roman Doctors think it sufficient, that a man believes as the Church believes, without an explicate knowledge of any thing they believe; but the general Opinion is, that a man must have an explicate belief of the Apostles Creed, but as for every thing else it suffices, if he believes as the Church believes. That is, as I inferred, it is not necessary men should so much as know, what the new Articles of the *Trent* Faith are, if they believe the Apostles Creed, and in other things resign up their Faith implicitly to the Church. From whence I concluded, that by their own confession all the Doctrines in dispute between us and the Church of *Rome* are of no use, much less necessary to salvation, for if they were they would be as necessary to be known, and explicitly believed, as the Apostles Creed; and therefore Protestants who believe the Apostles Creed, may be saved without believing the *Trent* Creed, for what we need not know, we need not believe. What does our Jesuite say to this? is an implicate Faith no Doctrine of their Church? have I misrepresented their Doctrine? he says nothing of this. But *ibis Calumniator* (he says, meaning poor calumniated me) *confounds what is to be known necessitate medii, so that he who through no fault of his hath not learned it, is however incapable of salvation (which is all contained in the Creed) with what must be known necessitate præcepti, because God hath commanded all those who are in the occasion and in the capacity of being instructed in it, to learn it.* Whatever I confounded, I am sure, this is a distinction would confound any man to reconcile it with an implicit Faith. Some things are so necessary to be known, that a man shall be damned meerly for not knowing them, though he had no opportunity to know them (which some will say is very hard) other things are necessary to be known to those who have opportunity to know them, for that I suppose he means, *by occasion and capacity*, or he means nothing but a trick;
and

and what place is here for an implicate Faith? when they must know all that is a necessary means of salvation, at the peril of their salvation, and must know every thing, as far as they have opportunity of learning it; and therefore must never take up with an implicate Faith. He says, *Each man is not bound to know all that Christ hath taught, but yet all that Christ has taught as necessary to him in his station*: So that if all Christians are not bound to have an explicate belief and knowledge of any thing but the Apostles Creed, then the knowledge of all the peculiar Doctrines of Popery, it seems, are not necessary for them in their station; and if they be not necessary for all Lay-Christians suppose in their station, they are necessary for no body but the Pope and his Clergy; and that is the truth of the story: for they are the only people that get any thing by them, and it concerns them only to know these matters.

Secondly, I proceeded to Holiness and Vertue, the promoting of which is another great Gospel-design; and shewed how many ways this is hindred in the Church of Rome.

I observed, *That great value the Church of Rome sets upon an external Righteousness, is very apt to corrupt mens notions of what is good, to persuade them that such external Observances are much more pleasing to God, and therefore certainly much better in themselves, than true Gospel-Obedience, than Moral and Evangelical Vertues: for that which will merit of God the pardon of the greatest Immortalities, and a great Reward, that which supplies the want of true Vertue, which compensates for sin, and makes men great Saints, must needs be more pleasing to God, than Vertue itself.* This he cites as a great Misrepresentation, and so it is, as he puts it; for he makes me say, that they teach all this: whereas all that I Pag. 72. say is, that these are natural inferences which men draw from that great value the Church of Rome puts upon an external Righteousness, and that such Conceits as these are very apt to make men careless of a holy life.

Thus he makes me say, *The Roman Church teaches, that men need take no care of venial sins, and that they may keep clear of mortal* Pag. 79. *sins, without any great attainment in Vertue.* But I never said, the Roman Church taught this. I say, *The Doctrine of venial sins, which cannot deserve eternal punishments, how many soever they are, is apt to give men very slight thoughts of very great evils: that*

A Vindication of the Second Part of

that while this distinction lasts, men have an excuse at hand for a great many sins, which they need take no care of. What! because the Church teaches, that they need not avoid venial sins? By no means! But because they shall not be damned for them, which is encouragement enough to most men to be careless about them: If they keep clear of mortal sins, they are safe, that is, as to eternal damnation; and that men may do without any great attainments in Vertue: which is certainly true, whoever teaches it, according to the Roman distinction between venial and mortal sins.

I shewed farther, that the Church of Rome makes void most of the Gospel Motives to a holy life. The second was the Holiness, and Purity, and inflexible Justice of the divine Nature, which enforces the necessity of Holiness, because a holy God cannot be reconciled to wicked men, nor forgive our sins, unless we repent and reform. *But the force of this Argument is lost in the Church of Rome by the Judicial Absolution of the Priest. For they see daily the Priest does absolve them without forsaking their sins, and God must confirm the Sentence of his Ministers; and therefore they are absolved, and need not fear that God will not absolve them: Which must either destroy all sense of God's essential Holiness and Purity, and persuade them, that God can be reconciled to Sinners, while they continue in their sins; or else they must believe that God hath given power to his Priests to absolve those whom he could not have absolved himself.* This he thus repeats: *They teach (for this must always come in to make me a Mis-representer) that when a Priest absolves men that forsake not their sins, God must confirm the Sentence of his Minister, and therefore they are absolved, and need not fear; whence they believe that God can be reconciled to sinners, whilst they remain in their sins; and therefore they must believe that God hath given power to his Priests to absolve those whom he could not absolve himself.* How unlike this is to what I said, I need not tell any man; but he has not only mis-represented my words and sense, but has made nonsense of it too, which is a little too much at once: for if they believe that God can be reconciled to sinners, while they continue in their sins, they need not believe that God had given power to the Priest to absolve those whom he could not absolve himself, that is, unreformed sinners; for if God can be reconciled to such men, who continue in their sins, he may absolve them too, as well as the Priest.

But

But I must not part with this point thus. I said, that *de facto* men saw that they are every day, or as oft as they please to go to confession, absolved by the Priest without forsaking their sins; is not this true? That they are taught that God confirms the Sentence of his Ministers, and when they are forgiven by the Priest, they are forgiven by God: That the Priest is a Judge and absolves as a Judge, by a true judicial, not a meer declarative power: Is not this true? And is not this reason enough for them to believe that when they are absolved by the Priest, without forsaking their sins, they are absolved by God? And does not this destroy that Argument from the holiness and justice of God, that he will not forgive our sins, unless we forsake them? But he says, *They teach, that to receive absolution without a real forsaking of our sins, in lieu of forgiveness of them, adds a heinous Sacrilege.* But how do they teach this, by words or actions? Their actions teach quite otherwise, for they absolve men over and over, who do not forsake their sins, though they know that they do not; and if such Absolutions do not avail to the forgiveness of sins, what greater security is there in the Popish judicial, than in the Protestant declarative Absolution? Nay, why do they cheat people out of their Souls, and lull them into security by such void Absolutions? Nor do their words teach any necessity of mens forsaking sin, to make their Absolution valid: Contrition is the most that is required to Absolution. Now suppose Contrition signifie a sorrow for sin, and a resolution to forsake it, yet Contrition is not forsaking sin, is not holiness of life; and if Absolution upon Contrition puts men into a state of salvation, then men may be saved by the Sacrament of Penance, without an actual forsaking of sin; for if they sin again, it is only repeating the same Remedy, the Sacrament of Penance, with the Absolution of the Priest, will restore them to the favour of God, and a state of salvation again. Which shews that the Church of *Rome* does not teach what he pretends; I wish she did, or that he would teach it for her, that the Absolution of the Priest will avail no man who does not actually forsake his sins, and reform his life, and then we should see what value men would have for their Judicial Absolution.

A third Gospel-Motive to Holiness, is the Death and Sacri-

fice of Christ, because his Blood is the Blood of the Covenant, and the efficacy of his Sacrifice, extends no farther than the Gospel-Covenant; that is, no man can be saved by the Blood of Christ, but those who obey the Gospel. This I observed the Church of Rome seems very sensible of, that the Sacrifice of the Cross will avail none but penitent and reformed Sinners. *But then the Sacrifice of the Mass is a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, to expiate those sins, which are not expiated by the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and that by the bare opus operatum, by the offering this Sacrifice of the Mass it self, without any good motion in the person for whom it is offered.* These are some more of his Mis-representations, to which he adds, *That when Christ was sacrificed upon the Cross, he expiated only for the eternal punishment of sin; when sacrificed in the Mass only, for the temporal.*

Pag. 82.

What has he to say to this, only three loud Calumnies. *We teach, that Christ on the Cross gave himself a full Redemption for all the guilt and debt of sinners, who apply to themselves that precious Blood by the means appointed by Christ.* Very tender this! But did Christ expiate the sins only of true penitent and reformed sinners? Is that the only means of applying his precious Blood to us? *That by the Sacrifice of the Mass, as also by any good Christian Prayers for obdurate sinners, such Graces may be obtained as shall work in them their salvation; but that no sin is remitted to an impenitent sinner.* Very artificial and trickish still! Does the Sacrifice of the Mass expiate sins, or not? Do other good Christian Prayers expiate sin? Why then does he join the Sacrifice of the Mass, and other good Christian Prayers, as if they attribute no more expiation to the Mass, than to Christian Prayers? Is the Sacrifice of the Mass to obtain Grace for sinners, or to expiate sin? Pray what Grace is obtained by the Sacrifice of the Mass for those who are dead? or is the Sacrifice of the Mass available for obdurate sinners, or for those only who are in a state of Grace? But pray, why not one word to the main case, that the Mass expiates those sins, for which the Sacrifice of the Cross made no Expiation? What he adds, *That no sin is remitted to an impenitent sinner,* is nothing to the purpose; the question is, Whether no man shall be pardoned, who does not reform his sin, and live a holy life? These

These are two things in the Church of *Rome*, where men receive Absolution upon their Contrition, as is pretended, who never reform their lives. But as for the *Opus Operatum* he tells us, *It hath no reference to him, who receives the Sacraments,--but to those who administer the Sacraments, from whose Piety they take not their force.* This I know *Cassander* and some other moderate *Romanists* would have to be the sense, but in contradiction to the Doctrine of their Church: I shall not enter into that Dispute now: our present case is very plain. For the Mass is offered for the living and the dead, for those who are absent and know nothing of it, and therefore cannot joyn in the Oblation of this Sacrifice; that if it have any virtue it must be its own, the bare *Opus Operatum*, without any good motion of him, for whom it is offered.

A Fourth Gospel Motive to Holiness is the Intercession of Christ for us at the right hand of God. Because he mediates and interceeds only for true penitent Sinners; which obliges us, as we hope for any benefit from the Intercession of Christ, heartily to repent of our sins, and live a new life: but the Church of *Rome* has found out a great many other Advocates and Mediators, who by their great Interest in Christ, or favour with God, may obtain that pardon, which otherwise they could not hope for: and that this must be the meaning of their Addresses to Saints and the Virgin *Mary*, I proved, because there is no other account to be given of it; for will they say, that Christ wants Will or Power to undertake our Cause, if we be such, as according to the terms of the Gospel it is his Office to interceed for: I confess'd, it was hard to think, that they should imagine, *that the Intercession of the Virgin Mary, or the most powerful Saints can prevail with our Saviour to do that, which according to the Laws of his own Mediation, they know be cannot and will not do.* But yet so it is, that is, thus they do, and there is no other account to be given of it but this. This he says is a bare-faced Calumny! But what is the Calumny? that they do pray to Saints and the Virgin? or that such vile Wretches hope to be heard by them, who could not reasonably expect, that Christ would hear them upon their own account? Let him have a care of calling this a Calumny; there are many fine Stories, how gracious the Blessed Virgin has

been to the most profligate Villains, which I suppose are related for this purpose to make such Wretches great Devotees of the Virgin.

What he says, *That the blessed Saints only join their Prayers to ours to obtain mercy of Christ*, is nothing to our present purpose: the Question is, Why those who have so merciful and compassionate an High-Priest, should make such frequent Addresses to other Advocates, if they did not hope to find them more pitiful and compassionate, to obtain that for them of their Saviour by their Interest and Intercession, which good men know, they may have of Christ for asking, without applying to other Advocates.

A Fifth Gospel Motive to a Holy Life is the hope of Heaven and the fear of Hell; but *then the terror of Hell is mightily abated by the Doctrine of Purgatory, for though Purgatory be a terrible place, yet it is not eternal; —especially considering how many easie ways there are for men to get out of Purgatory: those who can buy Indulgencies, while they live, or Masses for their Souls, when they die, need not lie long there, if the Priests are not out in their reckoning.*

Page 83.

Here he finds *three Calumnies*. The first, *That Catholicks exempt Sinners from Hell, who in the Protestant Doctrine would be condemned to it. No unrepented mortal sin is lodged in Purgatory, or escapes Hell.* Now I confess, though I did not say so, yet I think they do; and I grant it is a true consequence of my Argument: That all impenitent Sinners shall go to Hell, we both agree; but then we make the reformation of our lives essential to repentance, and how sorrowful soever men are for their sins, if they live after such sorrow and do not reform their lives, they shall go to Hell. In the Church of Rome, at most contrition or sorrow for sin is all that is necessary to Absolution, and that keeps them out of Hell, and such men must expiate their sins by Penance in this World, or in Purgatory in the next, but though they do not reform their sins, if they be contrite and absolved again, they are restored to a state of Grace again, and so *toties quoties*. Now such Penitents as are sorry for their sins, but do not reform them, are condemned to Hell in the Protestant Church, and only to Purgatory in the Church of Rome: and therefore the First is no.

no Calumny. The Second is, *That Indulgencies may be bought for Money*, this is no Calumny as I have already shewn, or avail a Soul undispofed to receive the benefit of them, through want of contrition, the guilt of sin not being before remitted. This I never said, and therefore is no Calumny of mine. The third, *That Masses said for any Soul in Purgatory avail such as during life have not deserved and merited that mercy*. This I take to be nonsense according to the Doctrines of their own Church. For certainly those Souls who have merited to get into Purgatory, have merit enough to receive the benefit of Masses.

Another Gospel-Motive to Holiness are the Examples of Good Men, but in the Church of Rome the extraordinary Vertues of great and meritorious Saints are not so much for imitation as for a stock of Merits. The more Saints they have, the less need is there for other men to be Saints, unless they have a mind to it, because there is a greater treasure of Merits to relieve those who have none of their own ---- and if one man can merit for twenty, there is no need there should be above one in twenty good. Here he quibbles upon the different acceptation of Merit, as it relates to a reward, or as it expiates the punishment of sin. In the first sense he says Merit is personal, not communicative; but if it be communicative in the second sense, that one man may be delivered from punishments by the Merits of another, (and if it be not, there is an end of the gainful trade of Indulgencies) that is sufficient to my Argument, and will satisfy most sinners, who are not concerned about degrees of glory, if they can escape punishment.

Lastly I shewed, that the Gospel-Means and Instruments of Holiness, do not escape much better in the Church of Rome: among others I instanced in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which besides those supernatural conveyances of Grace, which are annexed to it by our Saviour's Institution, is a great Moral Instrument of Holiness ---- but in the Church of Rome this admirable Sacrament is turned into a dumb shew, which nobody can be edified with, or into a sacrifice for the living and the dead, which expiates sin and serves instead of a holy life. Here he says, there are three crying Calumnies. 1. That the Sacrament among them is nothing but a shew or a sacrifice, whereas they very often receive it; and did I say the Sacrament was never

never received in the Church of Rome? 2. That they require *the practice of no Vertue* to the receiving the Sacrament, whereas they require the Sacrament of Penance to prepare for the Eucharist. But I spoke of those Vertues which were to be exercised in receiving, which there are not such advantages for in the Church of Rome, where the Office is not understood, and the mind diverted with a thousand insignificant Ceremonies. 3. *That our exposing the blessed Sacrament, is a dumb shew, and so we assist at holy Mass.* And whether it be or no, let those judge, who have seen the Ceremony. How much the Sacrifice of the Mass encourages Vertue, we have already seen.

I doubt not but our Jesuite can give as good an Answer to this Vindication, as he did to the *Preservative*, and I as little doubt but he will; unless Mr. Needham's Name to the License may be my security, for he has threatned, *it shall be to him a sufficient Note and Character of a Book, not worth the Reading, much less the Conjurings, where-ever he sees, that Reverend Person has opened it the Press:* and I commend him for it, for he has had very ill success with such Books of late: but though I never grudge my pains in answering an Adversary, who gives occasion for any useful and material Discourse, (for I desire whatever I say, should be sifted to the very bottom, and am as ready to own any Error, I am convinced of, as to vindicate the Truth), yet it is very irksome to be forced to write a great Book meerly to rescue my words from the injuries of a perverse Comment, which has been my present Task: Thus any Book may be answered, by a man, who has wit or ignorance enough to pervert it: and such Answers may be easily answered again by men, who have nothing else to do; but if this trade grow too common, they must be very idle people indeed, who will find time to read them.

And therefore to prevent such an impertinent trouble for the future, before I take leave of my Adversary, I will venture to give him a little good Advice, which may stand him in stead against the next time.

1. That he would be more modest and sparing in his Title-page; not to paint it so formidable as to make it ridiculous;

lous: it is a little too much to talk of *Principles which destroy all right use of Reason, Scripture, Fathers, Councils, undermine Divine Faith, and abuse Moral Honesty. Or Forty malicious Culumnies and forged untruths, besides several Fanatical Principles, which destroy all Church Discipline, and oppose Christ's Divine Authority.* If such things be proved against any Book, I assure you it is very terrible, though there be nothing of it in the Title, but the World has been so long deceived with Titles, that commonly the more the Title promises, the less they expect in the Book. Some cry it is a Mountebank's Bill, others, the Man raves, and if curiosity tempts any to look any farther, the disappointment they meet with, provokes their scorn, or indignation. The bare name of an Answer to a Book, which is commonly known and approved, is a sufficient invitation to all men to read it, but it is a very impolitick thing to prejudice the Readers by a frightful Title.

2. That he would not think, he has confuted a Book by picking out some sayings, which he thinks very inconvenient and obnoxious, but in which the main Argument of the Book is not concerned: this is the case in many passages he has objected against the Preservative, for though there is never a one, but what is very defensible, and what I have defended, yet there are many, that if they could not be defended, the main Argument of the Book is never the worse: This is as vain, as to think to kill a man by launishing a Sore, while all his Vitals are sound and untoucht.

3. That he would not boast of confuting a Book, without bearing up fairly to any one Argument in it.

I know in his Postscript, he says, *that he omitted nothing in Answer to the First part of the Preservative, that even pretended to the appearance of an Argument; that all the rest, which he did not answer in his single sheet, was only swelled up with words, but void of Sense and Reason.* A strange Tympany this poor Preservative was sick of, that when the wordy swelling was taken down, that and the Answer too could be reduced to a single sheet. But the Prefacer he says, *should have pointed at some pretended proofs, which he slighted to expose, or have praised him*

A Vindication of the Second Part of

him for not wearying his Readers with a dull prolixity. But the Prefacer pointed him to the Book, and that was enough, unless he would have had him transcribe the Book again, and concluded every entire Argument, with *this is not Answered by the Jesuite.* For I know not any one paragraph, that he has pretended to answer, though some single sayings he has nibbled at, and little pieces of Argument, as appears from this Vindication, and that so dully too, that there was no need of more prolixity to tire his Readers. Our Author little thinks, how he exposes his Reputation among our people by such vain brags as these: They can find a great many Arguments, which he has not medled with, and therefore conclude the Jesuite to be very blind, or very impudent in pretending to have answered all he could find, or (which it may be is the truth of the case) that he was not trusted to read the Preservative, but had some sayings picked out for him to answer, and he mistook them for the whole.

4/y, That when he talks big of Calumnies and Misrepresentation, he would not only say but prove them to be so: that is, that I attribute any Doctrines to them, which are not taught by their own Councils and Doctors, or impute such Practices to them, as they are not guilty of: for this Cry of Misrepresenting is grown so familiar now, and that Charge has been so often baffled of late, that our People will not take his Word for it, nor allow every Argument he cannot Answer, to pass for a Misrepresentation.

5/y, I would advise him to have a care, that he do not Confute his own Church, while he is zealous to Confute his Adversary; this often happens, and has done so to him in this very Dispute: especially in his Talk of Moral Infallibility, which has effectually given up the *Roman* pretences to Infallibility, as I have shewn above.

6/y, If he resolves to Write again; I desire him to take but any one Chapter or Section in the *Preservative*, and try his skill on it; not to pick out a single Saying or two, but to Answer the whole Series of Arguments, as they lie there; and

if he can make any work of it, I promise him a very grave and modest Reply.

But if he skips about from one Page to another, and only hunts for Calumnies and Misrepresentations as he calls them, which he first artificially makes, by changing Words and Periods, and joyning Sentences, which have no relation to each other, and then triumphs over his own Creatures, I shall leave him to be answered and chastized by any Footman, who pleases to undertake him, and I wish the next may not be so much his Over-match, as the first was.

I have taken no Notice of his Postscript in Answer to the Preface to the Protestant Footman's Defence of the *Preservative*. That Author is able to Answer for himself, if he thinks fit; but I presume he looks upon that Dispute as at an end, if Disputes must ever have an end: for when all is said, that a Cause will bear, and the same Arguments and the same Answers come to be repeated over again, it is time then for a modest man to have done, and to leave the World to judge; unless Disputing be only an Art of Scolding, where the last Word is thought the Victory.

T H E E N D.

By Wm. Rogers.
BY *Wilkins* his Fifteen Sermons. *Octavo.*

Dr. *Wallis* of the Necessity of Regeneration : In Two Sermons to the University of Oxford. *Quarto.*

His Defence of the Royal Society and the Philosophical Transactions ; particularly those of July, 1670. In Answer to the Cavils of Dr. *William Holder*. *Quarto.*

The Necessity, Dignity and Duty of Gospel-Ministers, discoursed of before the University of Cambridge. By *Tho. Hodges, B.D.* *Quarto.*

The Peaceable Christian. A Sermon. *Quarto.* Price, 3 d.

A Treatise of Marriage, with a Defence of the 32^d Article of the Church of England, viz. *Bishops, Priests and Deacons are not commanded by God's Law, either to Vow the State of Single Life, or to Abstain from Marriage, &c.* By *Tho. Hodges, B.D.* *Octavo.*

History of the Affairs of Europe in this present Age, but more particularly of the Republick of Venice. By *Battista Nani* Cavalier, of *St. Mark*. *Fol.*

Sterry's Freedom of the Will. *Folio.*

Light in the Way to Paradise, with other Occasionals. By *Dudley* the 2^d, late Lord *North*. *Octavo.*

Molins of the Muscles, with Sir *Charles Scarborough's* Syllabus Musculorum. *Octavo.*

A Collection of Letters of Gallantry. *Twelves.*

Leonard's Reports, in Four Parts. The Second Edition. *Folio.*

Bullstrode's Reports in Three Parts, the Second Edition Corrected ; with the Addition of Thousands of References. 1688. *Fol.*

The Compleat Clerk ; containing the best Forms of all sorts of Precedents, for Conveyances and Assurances ; and other Instruments now in Use and Practice. *Quarto.*

Sir *Simon Degges* Parsons Counsellor, with the Law of Tithes and Tithing. In Two Books. The Fourth Edition. *Octavo.*

An Answer to the Bishop of *Condom* (now of *Meaux*) his Exposition of the Catholick Faith, &c. wherein the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is Detected, and that of the Church of England Expressed, from the Publick Acts of both Churches. To which are added Reflections on his Pastoral Letter.

TH E Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, truly re-
sented; in Answer to a Book, intituled, *A Papist Misrepresented, and*
Represented, &c. Quarto. Third Edition.

An Answer to a Discourse, intituled, *Papists protesting against Protestant*
Popery; being a Vindication of *Papists* not *Misrepresented* by *Protestants*:
And containing a particular Examination of *Monſieur de Meaux*, late
Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*,
in the Articles of *Invocation of Saints*, *Worſhip of Images*, occasioned by
that Discourse. Quarto. Second Edition.

An Answer to the *Amicable Accommodation* of the Differences, between
the *Representer* and the *Answerer*. Quarto.

A View of the Controversie, between the *Representer* and the
Answerer; with an Answer to the *Representer's* last Reply; in which are
set open some of the Methods, by which *Protestants* are *Misrepresented*
by *Papists*. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and *Transubstantiation*, compared as to
Scripture, *Reason*, and *Tradition*; in a new Dialogue between a *Prote-*
stant and a *Papist*, the first Part: Wherein an Answer is given to the Tryal
Proofs of the Antiquity of *Transubstantiation*, in the Books called, *Consen-*
sus Veterum, and *Nubes Testium*, &c. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and *Transubstantiation*, compared as to
Scripture, *Reason*, and *Tradition*, in a new Dialogue between a *Protestant*
and a *Papist*, the Second Part: Wherein the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is
shewed to be agreeable, to *Scripture* and *Reason*, and *Transubstantiation*
repugnant to both. Quarto.

An Answer to the Eighth Chapter of the *Representer's* Second Part, in
the first Dialogue, between him and his Lay-Friend.

Of the Authority of *Councils*, and the Rule of *Faith*. By a Person of
Quality: With an Answer to the Eight *Theses*, laid down for the Tryal
of the *English Reformation*; in a Book that came lately from *Oxford*.

Sermons and Discourses, some of which never before Printed: The
Third Volume. By the Reverend Dr. *Tillotson*, Dean of *Canterbury*. 8^o.

A Manual for a *Christian Souldier*, Written by *Erasmus*, and Trans-
lated into *English*. Twelves.

* A new and easie Method to learn to Sing by Book, whereby one (who
hath a good Voice and Ear) may without other help, learn to Sing true
by Notes. Design'd chiefly for, and applied to, the promoting of *Psalm-*
ody; and furnished with Variety of *Psalm-Tunes* in Parts, with Dire-
ctions for that kind of *Singing*. Octavo.

A Book of *Cyphers*, or *Letters Reversit*: being a Work very pleasant
and useful, as well for Gentlemen as all sorts of Artificers, Engravers,
Painters.

A Discourse concerning the *Condemnation* of the *Mass* by the *Church of England*. In *Octavo*. Price 1s.

A Discourse against *Transubstantiation*. In *Octavo*. Price 1s.

The State of the Church of *Rome* when the Reformation began, as it appears by the Advices given to *Paul III.* and *Julius III.* by *Cousins* of their Own. With a Preface leading to the matter of the Book. 4s.

A Letter to a Friend, Reflecting on some *Letters* in a *Letter* to the *D. of P.* in Answer to the Arguing Part of *Mr. S.* in *1681*. 4s.

The *Reflector's* Defence of his *Letter* to a Friend, against the Assaults of *Mr. S.* in his second *Letter* to the *D. of P.* in *1681*. 4s.

A Discourse concerning the Nature of *Idolatry*, in which the Notion of *Idolatry* is true and only Notion of *Idolatry* is considered and Confuted. 4s.

The *Protestant* Resolv'd: or, a Discourse, proving the Reasonableness of his Turning *Roman Catholic* for Salvation. Second Edition. 4s.

The Absolute impossibility of *Transubstantiation* demonstrated. 4s.

The Practical Believer: or, the Articles of the Apostles Creed. Drawn out to form a True Christian's Heart and Practice. In two Parts. 4s.

A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend *Benj. Calamy, D.D.* and late Minister of *St. Lawrence-Gury, Lond.* Jan. 7th. 1681. 4s.

A Vindication of some *Protestant* Principles of Church-Unity and Catholic Communion, from the Charge of Agreement with the Church of *Rome*. In Answer to a late *Tract*, intitled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, evinced from the Consensus of her Sons with their Brethren the Dissenters*. 2d Edition. 4s.

A Discourse against *Papery*; being some Plain Directions to the learned and unlearned how to Dispute with *Romish* Priests. The First Part. The Foundation. 4s.

The Second Part of the Preservative against *Papery*: shewing how *Papery* is to the True Ends of the Christian Religion. Fitted for the Instruction of *Unlearned* Protestants. The Second Edition. 4s.

A Discourse concerning the Nature of Church-Unity and Communion in the Catholic Church; wherein some of the Controversies concerning Church-Unity are briefly and plainlly treated. The First Part. 4s.

The Second Part by *Thomas Mather, D.D.* Master of *St. John's College*. 4s.

